

Also, petition of Thomas A. Sullivan, Capt. Edward Dayton, and 44 citizens of Kenosha, Wis., requesting the repeal of section 904 of the revenue law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REBER: Petition of John Biskis and Peter Buscavage, of Tamaqua, Pa., and of Joseph Abravinsky and John A. Rutkowski, of Shenandoah, Pa., asking that the United States demand the withdrawal of Polish troops from Lithuanian territory and give to Lithuania a moral support in her war against Bolshevism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of the employees of the Boston Navy Yard, urging 44-hour week for employees of United States Navy Department; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Bottlers and Drivers' Union, No. 122, in favor of the league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YATES: Petition of Nikolaus Kuhn, 3309, Thirty-eighth Place, Chicago, Ill., protesting against the United States joining the league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Tenk Hardware Co., of Quincy, Ill., protesting against reduction of postal rates on advertising pages of magazines; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Farm Implement News, Masonic Temple, Chicago, Ill., urging repeal of zone postal rate advance; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Schneider & Metzger, Peoria, Ill., urging repeal of luxury tax, and also urging that Congress put an end to inefficient administration of our railroad and express systems which are unendurable; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Keith Swartz, Anti-Saloon League, Dixon, Ill.; Joseph J. Edwards, Forrest, Ill.; and Edward F. Rittenhouse, Pontiac, Ill., all urging enforcement of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE.

FRIDAY, July 18, 1919.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we present ourselves to Thee and open our hearts for the reception of Thy truth. Thou hast promised that Thou wilt write Thy laws in our hearts, and in our minds Thou wilt establish them. So we pray as we journey on to the duties of this day that we may have the guidance of the inward monitor—the law that is written deep in our own hearts, that is in conformity to the will of God. May we feel that our highest obligation is to do that which is pleasing in Thy sight. So do Thou bless us this day. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

### CABLEGRAM FROM THE ARGENTINE SENATE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a cablegram from the President of the Senate of the Argentine Nation, expressing its intense satisfaction for the signing of the treaty of peace, which will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

### PERMANENT RANK OF SUPERIOR OFFICERS (H. DOC. NO. 153).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

### To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I take the liberty of calling your attention to a matter which I am sure is at the heart of the whole country, and which I have had very much in mind throughout all these months when we were trying to arrange a peace that would be worthy of the spirit and achievements of the men who won the victory in the field and on the sea. After mature reflection, I earnestly recommend that you give the permanent rank of general to John J. Pershing and Peyton C. March, expressing the law in such a way as to give precedence to Gen. Pershing; and that you give the permanent rank of admiral to William S. Benson and William S. Sims. I take it for granted that I am only anticipating your own thoughts in proposing these honors for the men upon whom the principal responsibilities devolved for achieving the great results which our incomparable Navy and Army accomplished.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, 18 July, 1919.

### PROPAGANDA FOR LEGISLATION.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, during the last two or three days my mail has been largely burdened with letters, some of which are written, some in printed form, but practically identical in language, of which this is a sample:

The writer wishes to protest against the passage of Senate bill 2202, the Kenyon bill, on account of it being unjust, un-American, and socialistic.

The bill referred to is that introduced by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] to regulate the packing industry. My purpose in reading this communication into the RECORD is to emphasize the fact that a very obvious and a very common system of propaganda has been inaugurated against the bill.

I am not familiar with the merits of the bill; it may be subject to all the epithets which are made against it in this correspondence; but it would seem to me that those who are initiating it either have a very low opinion of the intelligence of the average Senator or else they go upon the theory that by demonstrating considerable political strength they can influence Senators in their ultimate determination of this bill. As a Member of this body I want to protest against the constant tendency to either oppose or commend to our attention bills and business before it by that method of appeal. It is becoming a nuisance and particularly to those of us who have other correspondence that is of substantial value to attend to.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 7343) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 7343, an act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and on motion of Mr. WARREN, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

### MILITARY AIR SERVICE.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, while I have the floor I want to refer to another subject briefly, and I will preface what I have to say by reading a very brief clipping from this morning's Washington Post. It is entitled "Air Service drops plans": SQUADRONS ABANDONED, AS OFFICERS WILL BE ONLY 222 ON SEPTEMBER 30.

Plans for the establishment of four observation air squadrons in the Philippines as part of the basic defense of the islands will have to be abandoned, Army officials said yesterday, unless some remedy is found for the present situation of the Air Service. Each of these squadrons requires 41 flying officers, and the entire commissioned personnel of the service will number only 222 by September 30.

Other important projects to be abandoned include 3 squadrons for Hawaii, 3 squadrons for Panama and 2 for the border patrol, and 40 balloon companies for the United States.

This announcement is doubtless due to the fact that the committee of conference on the Army supply bill were unable to agree upon a greater amount than \$25,000,000 for the Army Air Service, a sum which would be as well expended if it were taken out into midocean and sunk to the bottom of the sea, so far as any permanent benefit that it will confer upon our air service is concerned. The Senate Committee on Military Affairs, with practical unanimity, recommended and reported, and the Senate adopted, an appropriation of twice that amount, which was the lowest limit under the hearings that was commensurate with the adequacy and the needs of this service.

Now, I believe in economy as earnestly as any man, but I protest against that false economy which consigns this great arm of the service, both for offense and defense, into what is virtual abandonment.

Mr. President, the Air Service is the coming arm for defensive and for offensive purposes. It is so fully appreciated and recognized by our late allies in the war that they, notwithstanding their depleted finances and burden of taxation, are bending their energies and devoting large appropriations to the development of this service. We, with whom the airship originated—for it is an American invention—and who found ourselves so handicapped because of our neglect of it at the time we entered into the war, now propose to give little, if any, attention to it, in consequence of which, if trouble again arises, we shall be in the same situation in which we were when war was declared against Germany.

Mr. President, if the information which the public receive from the administration is reliable—and I hope it is—to the effect that the policy of "watchful waiting" with regard to Mexico is to be abandoned, and if we are to assume a firm attitude toward that country, we may happen to be precipitated into serious differences almost without warning. It will then



be a melancholy spectacle to the Nation, and doubtless one of great pleasure to any of our competitors, that we shall not possess a single air squadron—we, this mighty Nation, with its 100,000,000 people and with its recent experiences, notwithstanding its expenditures of \$100,000,000, will be bereft of the advantage this service affords. I want the country to understand that the Senate of the United States is not to be held responsible for this humiliating condition.

#### PROPAGANDA FOR LEGISLATION.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, with regard to the propaganda referred to by the Senator from Colorado, I wish to say that it is not all on the bill referred to by him; it is on nearly every bill that comes before Congress.

Mr. THOMAS. I stated that fact.

Mr. SMOOT. As far as that particular bill is concerned, I will say that I have received 10 petitions to support it against 1 in opposition to the bill.

Last Monday and Tuesday the Joint Committee on Printing held hearings on the question of what department publications should be discontinued after August 1. The representatives of the departments wherever they received an impression that any of the publications issued from their departments were to be discontinued or thought that the committee was inclined to discontinue them immediately began a propaganda by sending telegrams into nearly every State of the Union, requesting that individuals interested or subscribers immediately telegraph to the chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing protesting against the discontinuance of the publications.

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator will permit me, I want to emphasize the fact that the practice is becoming so common that it is not only ineffective but it is a nuisance. My impression is that the basis of it is on the assumption that a development of strength of a political character and a combination of voters will have its effect upon the action of the Senate. Congress is not in favor of prohibition; but Congress to-day is doing the will of the prohibitionists because Members of both Houses believe that the prohibition sentiment is better organized and stronger than any other; and people are carrying on the same propaganda in different ways.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the Senator excuse just a suggestion? Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think what the Senator from Colorado just said confirms what Tom Carlyle said, that public sentiment is not what everybody thinks, but what the people charged with public duty think that everybody thinks.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have wondered who paid for these telegrams. I happen to be chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, and as to the telegrams that I have received—floods of them—protesting against the discontinuance of certain publications, I know the parties who sent the telegrams do not pay the expenses of sending them; and I know that in the case of the telegrams sent from the department the Government of the United States will have to pay for them.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. In many cases, if the Senator will permit me, the parties sending the telegrams know nothing at all about the purpose for which they are sent.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is absolutely correct. I have received telegrams calling attention, for instance, to House resolution, say, 487, and the party sending the telegram knew no more about House joint resolution 487 than a baby knows. I have written such persons many times and asked them "what particular part of the resolution do you object to?" They have answered, and said they have not even seen the resolution, know nothing about it; and yet they are paying—or some one is paying—the expense of sending telegrams. Against this propaganda that is on Congress ought to express its dissent, and I believe every Senator and every Representative ought to announce that he will pay no attention to propaganda of this kind hereafter. Of the telegrams that I have received there is no difference in wording in any of them.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will excuse me in this connection, I received three so-called petitions addressed to me against the league of peace upon the ground that it was surrendering the sovereignty and independence of the United States; and in each case all the signatures were in the same handwriting, and the language was exactly the same in each petition. But I do not see any right that I have to quarrel about that. People have a right to wire me, and they have a right to send petitions, and they have a right to use propaganda, and, God knows, they have a right to suppose that Representatives and Senators will be influenced by political motives, and that if a Representative or Senator thinks that he may be defeated, he will take one course; and if he thinks not, he will probably

take another. Is it not, after all, our own fault? Is it not our own cowardice? If people did not believe that, they would not bring that sort of pressure to bear on us.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection whatever to any citizen of the United States writing to any Senator or Representative; and surely I have no objection to his writing to me, provided he expresses his own opinion and provided he pays the expense. I am not speaking about such requests. I am speaking about a propaganda started by the departments themselves.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh.

Mr. SMOOT. And the Government paying for the telegrams. I have not any doubt that there is some arrangement made by which the Government or somebody pays for the telegrams that we are receiving in this particular propaganda.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not want to be misunderstood about that. Of course, any propaganda started and carried on at the expense of the United States Government against either branch of the legislative body is wrong in every conceivable form. I was not talking about that. I was going back to the basic point at the root of all of it; and the basic point at the root of all of it is that if politicians, Senators, and Representatives were not cowards, this sort of pressure would not be here bothering us to-day.

Mr. SMOOT. There is a great deal of truth in what the Senator says.

Mr. KING and Mr. SMITH of Georgia addressed the Chair. The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. SMOOT. I will yield first to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Not only would it be improper to use public money, but it would be also equally as improper for public officials to take the money of parties in interest and send out telegrams at their expense while they are in public employment.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that some of the telegrams I have received protesting against the publication of certain documents have reference to documents which the committee have no idea of discontinuing at all and never have had.

I now yield to my colleague.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I received a letter four or five days ago. It was unusually frank and candid, differing from many of those that are written to Senators and Congressmen. The writer stated that he had received word from a certain bureau in the Department of Agriculture that owing to the penuriousness of Congress in failing to make adequate appropriations for a certain publication it was to be discontinued or its usefulness very much minimized, and protesting against it, and insisting that we make large appropriations for the continuation of that publication. He confessed that he got his inspiration from the department; the department had written him and he was asked to write me because I had been somewhat strong in my opposition to departmental publications and bureau publications, many of which are but a waste of printer's ink and an annoyance and an unnecessary expense to the Government.

Mr. SMOOT. I think I received a protest from the same gentleman to whom my colleague has referred, and at the bottom of it there was a threat in which he predicted what would happen to me if I did not do such and such a thing. All I wish to do at this time is to call attention to the fact that I believe the departments of the Government ought to cease propaganda of this sort. If it affects me in any way it is that if I were favorable to a proposition and the head of some department began a propaganda of the kind that is going on now I would almost feel like changing my attitude, if for no other reason than to let the departments know that Senators and Representatives will act upon their judgment irrespective of what propaganda may be started.

Mr. WARREN. Apropos of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Colorado and the distinguished Senator from Utah, I will ask the Secretary to read section 6 of the third deficiency appropriation act, which refers directly to this matter and which was sought to be corrected by the Committee on Appropriations, who reported that bill, which Congress passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes.

SEC. 6. That hereafter no part of the money appropriated by this or any other act shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertise-

ment, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation; but this shall not prevent officers and employees of the United States from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or to Congress, through the proper official channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business.

Any officer or employee of the United States who, after notice and hearing by the superior officer vested with the power of removing him, is found to have violated or attempted to violate this section, shall be removed by such superior officer from office or employment. Any officer or employee of the United States who violates or attempts to violate this section shall also be guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$500 or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.

Mr. WARREN. That would seem to cover the case. It is the current law, and I hope and I believe it will be enforced.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from Wyoming one question before he concludes. It seems to me that that goes a little bit too far. It says except when some executive officer shall be requested by a Member of Congress. I think that every executive officer, even in the most subordinate capacity, ought to be left free to write directly to a Senator or Representative and advocate an appropriation or the cessation of one, whichever he chooses. I would suggest when the Senator finally brings the matter before the Senate that he leave that out and do not say "upon request of a Member of Congress."

Mr. WARREN. I think the Senator did not hear me when I stated that it is current law, a law which was passed some weeks ago.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I did not hear the Senator say that, and if I had, it would not change my view that so much of it ought to be corrected at once, because undoubtedly an executive officer or the head of a bureau or department ought to be left perfectly free, upon his own initiative, to advise me or you or the Senator from Utah or any other Senator as to what he thinks would be an improvement in the law in order to better carry on the business of the Government. To make it a penal offense to do that without our request is making ourselves a lot of Prussian junkers, in a way. We do not want to do that, of course. That law ought to be corrected to that extent.

#### PEACE TREATY AND LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. BECKHAM. Mr. President, on Monday next, at the close of the morning business, I shall ask the privilege of addressing the Senate on the subject of the pending peace treaty and the league of nations.

#### TRANSFER OF SHANTUNG TO JAPAN.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I give notice that on Thursday next, at the conclusion of the routine morning business, if the business of the Senate permits, I shall discuss the provisions of the treaty of peace relating to Shantung.

#### TREATY OF PEACE WITH GERMANY.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I gave notice that on the 14th instant I should take occasion to briefly present to the Senate my views with regard to certain reservations upon the peace treaty. I desire to submit to the Senate my views with reference to that matter on next Wednesday morning, provided no Senator has given notice that he desires to occupy that time. If so, with the permission of the Senate, I will discuss the matter on Friday morning at the close of morning business, not only with relation to the legal effect but also with respect to the political effect of such reservations.

#### LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. GAY. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that on Tuesday, July 29, I shall address the Senate on the league of nations.

#### MILITARY AIR SERVICE.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, a few moments ago the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] referred to the possible necessity for further airplanes and some criticism of the action of Congress or of the department with reference to the discharge of officers in the service. I send to the desk a letter from the governor of New Mexico containing a telegram from the governor of Texas upon this subject, and I ask that it may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

STATE OF NEW MEXICO,  
Santa Fe, July 11, 1919.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have this day received a telegram from Hon. W. P. Hobby, governor of Texas, which is in words and figures as follows, to wit:

Gov. O. A. LARRAZOLO,  
Santa Fe, N. Mex.:

Knowing the Mexican situation as I do and believing that some action by the United States Government with reference to conditions in Mexico and along the border will be necessary in the near future, I view with alarm the action of the War Department in demobilizing and discharging all officers of the National Army, which will practically wipe out the Air Service. To my mind, it is imperative that Congress make some provisions for a continuation in service of a reasonable number of the National Army officers until a permanent military policy has been established, as it would be impossible to get these trained officers, upon whom the Government has spent millions of dollars, especially in the aviation branch, back into service after being discharged. Please wire your Senators and Representatives to aid this matter.

W. P. HOBBY,  
Governor of Texas.

I agree with Gov. Hobby that the policy of demobilizing and discharging the officers of the National Army now on duty, principally along the Mexican frontier, is rather an improvident one, and that at least until matters in Mexico assume a permanently peaceful and orderly condition a sufficient number of such trained officers and soldiers should be kept on duty along the border, and this, as you can readily understand, as a necessary protection to our people and interests.

I therefore suggest to you the advisability of conferring with the War Department and of calling the attention of the Secretary of War to this matter, with the request that a sufficient force, commanded by competent and trained officers, be maintained along the Mexican border until such time as their further presence there is shown to be unnecessary.

Hoping that you will attend to this request, I beg to remain,  
Very sincerely, yours,

Hon. A. B. FALL,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

O. A. LARRAZOLO, Governor.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I have not complied with the request of the governor in so far as taking up this matter with the War Department is concerned because I am informed that the War Department has no recourse; that the Congress of the United States having failed to make provision for these officers it has become necessary for the War Department to take the action which they have taken. I should like to know from the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee if that is not a correct statement of the case.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. FALL. I do.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. As the Senator is on the floor, I desire to state that I have been to the War Department in an effort to have as many soldiers as possible kept along the international line from Texas to the California coast. I have been assured that Gen. Cabell, who is in charge of this, was keeping the War Department advised of the conditions existing, and I have been informed likewise that every possible protection would be taken to sufficiently guard the border. I confess that, judging from the letters I have received from the towns along the border of Arizona, they are not satisfied. I believe they are absolutely sincere in it and know what they are doing; and I should welcome any act, either by the department or by the Congress, that will put beyond peradventure any threatened danger to the American people along the border between the two Republics.

While I am on my feet I will say in that connection that at some later day in this session I may have something to say about the conditions in Mexico as revealed to me from public prints and from private letters, and will submit to the Congress the necessity of some steps being taken to safeguard the lives and property of the people not only on the border but those living in Mexico under the invitation, if you please, of the Republic of Mexico.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona did not catch fully the statement I was making.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. That is true; I could not hear the Senator.

Mr. FALL. I will repeat for the Senator's benefit that I stated that I had not presented to the War Department this communication to me from the governor of New Mexico, inclosing to me the telegram from the governor of Texas, because my information was that the War Department could do nothing in the matter; that the Congress of the United States itself, by cutting off appropriations, had rendered it necessary that the War Department should discharge these officers whom these governors seem to think are so necessary for the protection of the border in the aeronautic service, and I had just requested the chairman of the committee to state whether my information was incorrect.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Before the chairman answers the question I want to inquire of the Senator if there are not enough soldiers that could be sent to that place for the proper and full



defense of that whole border without endangering the safety of the balance of the country? If there is any place in the world where we need the soldiers now, in my judgment, it is along that border.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I will take just a moment or two to express my views on that subject. I shall trespass for only a minute upon the time of the Senate.

In my judgment, sir, the trouble along the border is that the troops there have not the proper orders. In my judgment, if they were ordered to prevent raids or incursions upon this side and to take any means which they thought necessary to preserve order along the border and to protect the lives and property of American citizens one-tenth the number now on the border could do it. We have a border of very great length, 1,400 miles, practically unprotected. We have enough troops to patrol every mile of it, and more; but the difficulty is that they must so conduct themselves as not to bring this country into a possible conflict with anyone who may be temporarily exercising power in Mexico. The consequence is that the faces of our troops along the border, guarding us ostensibly from raids from the other side, are turned toward the north instead of toward the south to prevent incursions of American business men owning property in Mexico into the Republic, at least upon a great many occasions, at various points. They are attempting to prevent smuggling, as they call it, from this side to the other side, and they overlook the smuggling from the other side to this side. They do pursue a hot trail, as they call it, when they can get orders from a superior officer to pursue a hot trail; and I may say that the troops, in so far as their orders are concerned, have performed their duty magnificently. The people of the United States do not know that at least 12 times within the last 4 or 5 or 6 months the troops of the United States have gone across the Mexican border and have pursued Mexican marauders, and when they examined the bodies invariably they found the uniforms of the Carranza regular soldiers upon the bodies of at least some of those marauders whom they were pursuing. Col. Langhorne and the officers under him in the Great Bend district in Texas have done magnificent service, and if they were turned loose and told to stop it they would stop the trouble along the border.

Now, I renew the request for information from the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, with respect to the Air Service, which was discussed here a few minutes ago, we might just as well face the facts as they are. The Army appropriation bill made an exceedingly severe cut in the Air Service appropriations and brought the appropriations down to such a point, not only in the matter of the appropriation of \$25,000,000 for maintenance, operation, experiment, and construction, but also in the pay appropriation for the Army, that the Air Service is practically reduced to a shell. There will be little left of it by September 30. Between now and September 30 every emergency officer serving in the Air Service must be discharged, for the simple reason that by September 30 there will not be any money to pay such officers. The same is true in every other branch of the Army, but the effect upon the Air Service is the more serious, because it was among the emergency officers that we found our fliers.

I am informed by the Chief of the Air Service that this will leave on September 30 a total commissioned personnel in the Air Service of 232 officers. Practically all of those will have to be assigned to purely administrative duties, and we will have, in effect, no fliers at all.

It is idle to talk about the De Haviland planes, of which we have something like 3,000 in storage, in good, bad, or indifferent condition. If the present plans go through—and I think myself the War Department is quite helpless in the matter—there will be no one to fly the planes. I say "no one." There may be ten or a dozen men who might be gathered here and there out of the regular service who have become fliers during this war and who can be taken away from the administrative work; but to all intents and purposes there will be no active flying service in the Army of the United States after September 30 next.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I have been somewhat critical in the past of the War Department, although not vociferously so, and I simply wanted to do that department justice in this matter, as I understood the facts about it, by saying that if there is any blame whatsoever to be placed in the particular matter under discussion it is the fault of the Congress of the United States and not the fault of the War Department.

Mr. WADSWORTH. And may I interject the observation that it can hardly be said to be the fault of the Senate?

Mr. FALL. That is my understanding.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President, will the chairman of the committee permit a question? Is it not true that 90 per cent of these planes, or a great portion of them, are to be turned back

to the original manufacturers at about 10 per cent of the cost of making them?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think the Senator from Kentucky must be referring to training planes. It is true that the department is endeavoring to sell at the best figures it can the training planes, of which we have a tremendous surplus; but the only combat plane, or so-called combat plane, that we have in any quantity is the De Haviland 4, which already, I may say, is, by comparison with foreign planes, out of date, but it is a serviceable plane. The trouble is we will not have men to fly it.

Mr. STANLEY. Have we not any battle planes?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The De Haviland 4 is the only plane we have which is used in aerial warfare of any kind or description.

Mr. STANLEY. Are these training planes serviceable for any other service than training planes?

Mr. WADSWORTH. They are not. You can not mount guns on them. You can not do active work with them. They are only to train men to fly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, are they being sold at 10 per cent of their cost?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That matter was discussed when the Army appropriation bill was before the Senate. It is true that 2,700 training planes were sold at something like 10 or 15 per cent of their original cost. Some were entirely out of condition, some were in poor condition, some were in good condition.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What was the reason or the excuse, whichever it may be, given for that transaction?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That nobody wanted them in large quantities.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Could they not have been retailed, then, to a little bit better advantage?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Well, that is a question of policy. I am not prepared to defend the War Department on that point nor to criticize it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not asking the Senator to defend the War Department. I am merely asking his opinion.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator asked me a question, and I am endeavoring to answer it. I can give the Senator the War Department's explanation, and I have to trust to my recollection, which may be somewhat inaccurate. According to my recollection, the War Department asserted that it would have been dangerous to sell training planes to individual citizens all over the country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Why?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Because many of those planes are not in good repair, and accidents would inevitably follow their falling into the hands of individual citizens; and the War Department contended that it would be a bad policy for the Government to sell 2,700 planes, in all degrees of defective condition or lack of repair, and let them be scattered all over the country, and have crashes and accidents and complaints following. So, rather than do that, they sold a large number to the Curtiss Co., who agreed to take them just as they ran. Some of them were standing in hangars, some of them were on factory floors, some of them had flown almost to destruction, some had been flown very little. The Curtiss Co. agreed to take a certain number just as they ran, and to get them out of the country, and to let somebody else do the crashing.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course, if that be true, the department was justified in violating the maxim of "caveat emptor"; but are not the materials in an airplane worth more than 10 per cent of its cost, even if you are going to junk it?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I can not tell the Senator from Mississippi. I do not know.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not know, either. I thought perhaps the Senator did.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York permit me to make an inquiry?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I rise to a question of order. I should like to know if the morning business is concluded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has not started yet.

Mr. LODGE. I thought we were under the order of petitions and memorials.

The VICE PRESIDENT. We are. We have had one petition.

Mr. LODGE. We are acting under that order, then. There are a number of Senators who are pretty busily engaged who have been sitting here trying to get an opportunity to dispose of some morning business. Therefore I ask for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator can have it. Are there further petitions and memorials?

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. MOSES. I present resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of the Friends of Irish Freedom of Walpole, N. H., remonstrating against the adoption of the covenant of the league of na-



tions. I ask that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 12, 1919.

HON. GEORGE H. MOSES,  
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. MOSES: At a mass meeting of the Friends of Irish Freedom of the Town of Walpole, N. H., held July 6, 1919, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

"Resolved, That we are opposed to any league of nations that does not safeguard the Monroe doctrine and the absolute right of the American people to decide for themselves what is necessary for their welfare and happiness.

"Resolved, A league of nations founded on force of millions of subject races is not a desirable amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, and we request our Senators to vote against it.

"Resolved, That we demand the freedom of Ireland and all subject races before we consider a league of nations.

"Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to our Senators in Congress."

FRIENDS OF IRISH FREEDOM OF WALPOLE, N. H.  
WM. J. KING.  
PATRICK REARDON.  
JOHN HEALEY.

Mr. MOSES. I present resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of sundry Lithuanian citizens of Manchester, N. H., which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LITHUANIANS OF MANCHESTER, N. H.,  
122 Merrimack Street, July, 1919.

HON. GEORGE H. MOSES,  
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

HONORABLE SIR: We, the Lithuanians of the city of Manchester, N. H., have, in mass meeting assembled, adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas Lithuania was for ages an independent State, whose inhabitants, a distinct ethnic group, have never renounced their right to independence; and

"Whereas the establishment of the independent Lithuanian State would add materially to the future peace of the world: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That we, the Lithuanians of this city and citizens of the United States of Lithuanian descent, request the United States Government, through the honorable Representative of our district and the honorable Senators of our State, to recognize the complete independence of the Lithuanian Republic."

R. KONDROTAS, *Chairman.*  
J. A. ZUKAUSKAS, *Secretary.*

Mr. MOSES. I present resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of sundry Lithuanians of the Roman Catholic Parish of All Saints, of Manchester, N. H., which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROMAN CATHOLIC PARISH OF ALL SAINTS,  
Manchester, N. H., July 13, 1919.

To his honor GEORGE H. MOSES,  
*House of Senators, Washington, D. C.*

HONORABLE SIR: We, members of the Lithuanian Roman Catholic Parish of All Saints, of the city of Manchester, N. H., in a meeting assembled at Battery Building, Manchester Street, Manchester, N. H., have adopted the following resolution:

Whereas the invasion by the Polish Army of Lithuania is a brutal violation of the war aims declared by President Wilson and the allied governments, condemned by liberal opinion the world over as indefensible interference with the right of self-determination of nations;

Whereas Lithuania was for ages an independent State, whose inhabitants, a distinct ethnic group, have never renounced their right to independence: Be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the parish and American citizens of Lithuanian descent, hereby request the United States Government to compel Poland to withdraw her army from the Lithuanian territories, and that all assistance be denied to Poland as long as she continues to occupy the invaded territories; and be it further

Resolved, That we request the United States Government to recognize the present Lithuanian Government and to render it moral and material assistance.

L. J. JAKAITIS,  
*Chairman.*  
FELIX CHEKUTIS,  
*Secretary.*

Mr. MOSES. I present resolutions adopted by Lodge No. 119, Lithuanian Roman Catholic Alliance of America, of Manchester, N. H., which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROMAN CATHOLIC ALLIANCE OF AMERICA, LODGE NO. 119,  
Manchester, N. H., July 13, 1919.

To his honor GEORGE H. MOSES,  
*House of Senators, Washington, D. C.*

HONORABLE SIR: We, members of the Lithuanian Roman Catholic Alliance of America, Lodge 119, located in the congressional district of the city of Manchester, N. H., have in a meeting assembled at the lodge hall, 153 Manchester Street, adopted the following resolution:

Whereas Lithuania was for ages an independent State, whose inhabitants, a distinct ethnic group, have never renounced their right to independence;

Whereas the establishment of an independent Lithuanian State would add materially to the future peace of the world: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the lodge and citizens of the United States of Lithuanian descent, request the United States Government, through the honorable Representative of our district and the honorable Senators of our State, to recognize the complete independence of the Lithuanian Republic.

L. J. JAKAITIS,  
*Chairman.*  
J. A. ZUKAUSKAS,  
*Secretary.*

Mr. CAPPER presented petitions of Midland Grange, No. 1681, Patrons of Husbandry, of Burrton; of Local Grange, No. 1812, Patrons of Husbandry, of Reno; of Ninescah Grange, No. 1878, Patrons of Husbandry, of Sylvia; and of Highland Grange, No. 1790, Patrons of Husbandry, of Topeka, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Independence, Kans., and a petition of sundry citizens of Goodland, Kans., praying for the repeal of the tax on automobiles, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Goessel, Kans., and a petition of sundry citizens of Harper County, Kans., praying for the repeal of the tax on ice cream, soda, soft drinks, medicines, toilet articles, clothing, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I present a communication from the League of Free Nations Association, inclosing a resolution adopted at the national conference of that association, based upon a referendum vote of its members throughout the country. I ask that the communication and accompanying resolution be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The communication and accompanying resolution were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEAGUE OF FREE NATIONS ASSOCIATION,  
New York City, July 9, 1919.

Senator DAVID I. WALSH,  
Wardman Park Inn, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: The inclosed resolution, based upon a referendum vote of members throughout the country, was passed last night at a national conference of this association.

Very truly, yours,

JAMES G. McDONALD,  
*Chairman.*

Resolved, That the League of Free Nations Association, in accordance with a referendum of its full membership, calls upon all forward-looking citizens to urge the United States Senate—

1. To ratify without reservations the treaty with Germany, including the league of nations covenant.

Such ratification would establish immediate peace, the world's most urgent need, in the interest of order and progress; would abolish many international injustices which have proved prolific causes of war; and would create an agency for the rectification of remaining injustices and for the establishment of mutually advantageous and just relations between nations.

2. To accompany its ratification with a resolution, declaring it to be the purpose of the United States, as a member of the league of nations, to—

(a) Press for the immediate restoration of Kiaochow and the German concessions in Shantung to the Chinese Republic.

(b) Hold that nothing in the treaty or the covenant shall be construed as authorizing interference by the league in internal revolutions or as preventing genuine redress and readjustment of boundaries, through orderly processes provided by the league, at any time in the future that these may be demanded by the welfare and manifest interest of the people concerned.

(c) Call for the inclusion of Germany in the council of the league as soon as the new Republic shall have entered in good faith upon carrying out the treaty provisions; for the inclusion of Russia as soon as the Russian people establish stable government; and for the full participation of both Germany and Russia on equal footing in all economic intercourse as the best insurance against any reversion to the old scheme of balance of power, economic privilege, and war.

(d) Press for the progressive reduction of armaments by all nations.

(e) Throw its whole weight in behalf of such changes in the constitution and such developments in the practice of the league as will make it more democratic in its scheme of representation, its procedure more legislative and less exclusively diplomatic; an instrument of growth invigorated and molded by the active, democratic forces of the progressive nations.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts presented memorials of employees of the Hood Rubber Co., of Watertown; of the H. J. Heinz Co.; of Charles H. Horne & Co., of Averill; of the Hazen-Brown Co., of Boston; of the Truscon Steel Co., of Boston; of the Ideal Vogue Shoe Co., of Averill; of Kenworthy Bros. Co., of Stoughton; of the Babson Statistical Organization; of the Loose-Wiles Biscuit Co., of Boston; of the Rice, Barton & Fales Co., of Worcester; of Robert G. Pratt & Co.; of George C. Vaughan, of Peabody; of the Angier Chemical Co., of Boston; of Putnam & Cross, of Lynn; of the Weber Piano Co.; of Rogers Lunt & Bowles Co.; of the Bicknell-Thomson Co., of Greenfield;

of the Columbia Steel & Shafting Co., of Boston; of the Hunt-Spiller Manufacturing Co., of Boston; of Robbins Gamwell & Co., of Pittsfield; of Wadsworth, Howland & Co., of Boston; of the John Hood Co., of Boston; of the Springfield Printing & Binding Co.; of the L. E. Knott Apparatus Co.; of the Beaver Mills, of North Adams; of the American Bosch Magneto Corporation; of John P. Squire & Co.; of the Barrett Co.; of Whitney & Co., of Leominster; of the Globe Automatic Sprinkler Co.; of the Cheney Bigelow Wire Works, of Springfield; of the J. D. Clark Co., of Rochdale; of the Standard Plunger Elevator Co., of Worcester; of the Potter Drug & Chemical Co., of Malden; of the Burmus Paper Co. (Inc.); of the United Button Co.; of the Spencer Box Co.; of the Sulpho-Naphthol Co.; of the A. E. Little Co., of Brockton; of the Wire Goods Co., of Worcester; of the Merrimack Manufacturing Co., of Lowell; of C. B. Sampson, of Holyoke; of the Armour Leather Co., of Boston; and of the Baker-Vawter Co., of Holyoke, all in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. ROBINSON presented resolutions adopted by the board of directors of the St. Francis levee district of Arkansas, in annual meeting at Bridge Junction, Ark., favoring the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SUTHERLAND presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Braxton County, W. Va., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2847) providing additional aid for the American Printing House for the Blind, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, which was agreed to.

Mr. MYERS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 793) authorizing the issuance of patent to the Milk River Valley Gun Club (Rept. No. 88); and

A bill (S. 794) granting lands for school purposes in Government town sites on reclamation projects (Rept. No. 89).

REV. E. M. MALLORY AND REV. E. BELL.

Mr. LODGE. From the Committee on Foreign Relations I report back favorably with amendments Senate resolution 124, submitted by Mr. SMITH of Georgia on the 17th instant, and I ask for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendments were, in line 1, before the word "is," to strike out "Secretary of State" and insert "President"; in the same line, after the word "hereby," to strike out "directed" and insert "requested"; in line 2, after the word "Senate," to insert "if not incompatible with the public interest"; in line 3, after the word "in," to strike out "his," and in the same line, after the word "possession," to insert "of the State Department," so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That the President is hereby requested to furnish to the Senate, if not incompatible with the public interest, the records in the cases and all papers in possession of the State Department connected with the cases of Rev. E. M. Mallory, charged with harboring criminals, and Rev. E. Bell, charged with involuntary homicide, they being citizens of the United States and residents at the time in Korea.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I have received a number of communications from parties acquainted, as they thought, with the facts complaining very bitterly of trials or alleged trials in Korea and of treatment of our citizens as well as the natives and other citizens. I did not present to the Senate or make public those communications; I thought it hardly wise to do so; but when these two cases were brought to my attention, when two alleged trials of American missionaries in Korea were referred to, with the further statement that the records were in the State Department, and that they would give us an appreciation of what was taking place, I felt that at least we ought to have those records, as requested by those who wrote to us, and find out from them, if we could, something of an accurate character. It was for that reason that I offered the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

#### FORT PECK INDIAN RESERVATION.

Mr. MYERS. I present the report of the Committee on Public Lands on Senate bill 183, with amendments, and I submit a report (No. 90) thereon. It is a bill introduced by my colleague [Mr. WALSH], and is intended to afford partial relief to the homesteaders on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, in Montana. They have suffered from terrible drought for three years. I ask that the bill be read, and then I shall ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That any person who has made homestead entry under the provisions of the act of Congress approved May 30, 1908 (35 Stats. L. p. 558), entitled "An act for the survey and allotment of lands now embraced within the limits of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, in the State of Montana, and the sale and disposal of all the surplus lands after allotment," may obtain an extension of time for one year from the anniversary of the date of entry last preceding the passage of this act within which to pay the one-half of the installment then due or such part of any preceding installment, where payment has not yet been made and where an extension of time therefor is not authorized by the act of Congress approved March 2, 1917 (39 Stats. L. p. 994), by paying interest at the rate of 5 per cent per annum on the sums to be extended from the maturity of the unpaid installments to the expiration of the period of extension, the interest to be paid to the receiver of the land office for the district in which the lands are situated, within such time as may be prescribed for that purpose by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That the one-half of any installment which becomes due within one year from the passage of this act and for which an extension of time for payment is not authorized by the said act of March 2, 1917, may also be extended for a period of one year by paying interest thereon in advance at the said rate: *Provided further*, That any payment so extended may annually thereafter be extended for a period of one year in like manner, but no payment shall be extended beyond eight years from the date entry nor shall any extension be granted for less than one year: *And provided further*, That if commutation proof is submitted all the unpaid payments must be made at that time.

Sec. 2. That moneys paid as interest provided for herein shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the Fort Peck Indians, the same as moneys realized from the sale of the lands.

Sec. 3. That the failure of an entryman to make any payment that may be due, unless the same be extended, or to make any payment extended either under the provisions hereof or under the provisions of the said act of March 2, 1917, at or before the time to which such payment has been extended, shall forfeit the entry and the same shall be canceled, and any and all payments theretofore made shall be forfeited.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The amendments were, on page 2, line 17, after the word "may," to strike out "annually," and in line 18, after the word "manner," to strike out "but no payments shall be extended beyond eight years from the date of entry, nor shall any extension be granted for less than one year," so as to read:

That any person who has made homestead entry under the provisions of the act of Congress approved May 30, 1908 (35 Stat. L. p. 558), entitled "An act for the survey and allotment of lands now embraced within the limits of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, in the State of Montana, and the sale and disposal of all the surplus lands after allotment," may obtain an extension of time for one year from the anniversary of the date of entry last preceding the passage of this act within which to pay the one-half of the installment then due, or such part of any preceding installment, where payment has not yet been made and where an extension of time therefor is not authorized by the act of Congress approved March 2, 1917 (39 Stat. L. p. 994), by paying interest at the rate of 5 per cent per annum on the sums to be extended from the maturity of the unpaid installments to the expiration of the period of extension, the interest to be paid to the receiver of the land office for the district in which the lands are situated within such time as may be prescribed for that purpose by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That the one-half of any installment which becomes due within one year from the passage of this act and for which an extension of time for payment is not authorized by the said act of March 2, 1917, may also be extended for a period of one year by paying interest thereon in advance at the said rate: *Provided further*, That any payment so extended may thereafter be extended for a period of one year in like manner: *And provided further*, That if commutation proof is submitted all the unpaid payments must be made at that time.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. WARREN. From the Committee on Appropriations I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 7343) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes. I give notice that I shall ask the Senate to take up the bill for consideration immediately upon the conclusion of the routine morning business.



## BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 2527) to amend section 4875 of the Revised Statutes, to provide a compensation for superintendents of national cemeteries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NUGENT:

A bill (S. 2528) to grant certain lands to the city of Pocatello, State of Idaho, for conserving and protecting the source of its water supply and as a municipal park site; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 2529) to appropriate money for the relief of impoverished and suffering homesteaders and other farmers in the drought-stricken western regions of the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. JONES of New Mexico:

A bill (S. 2530) to authorize an advance to the "reclamation fund" for the prompt completion of drainage work on the Rio Grande project (Texas-New Mexico), and other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 2531) donating a captured cannon or fieldpiece and cannon balls to the town of Follansbee, Brooke County, W. Va.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

A bill (S. 2532) to incorporate the Private Soldiers' and Sailors' Legion of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 2533) granting an increase of pension to George E. Guthrie (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Arizona:

A bill (S. 2534) granting an increase of pension to Anton Mazzanovich (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

## PRICE OF COAL.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I offer a resolution which I ask to have read and referred to the Committee on Contingent Expenses, and also that it be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce if that is in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 126) was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Whereas for several years the price of coal to the consumer has from time to time been largely increased; and  
Whereas for a period this increase in price was attributed to existing war conditions; and  
Whereas in spite of the fact that since the armistice was signed, November 11, 1918, normal peace conditions have prevailed, the price of coal has continued to rise, without any apparent economic or other proper reason therefor: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof, be instructed to make inquiry into the cause or causes which have brought about the enormous increase in the market price of coal, and to that end obtain full data regarding freight rates, wages, profits, and other matters bearing upon the question under consideration, with a view to determining who or what may be responsible for such increase in price, whether due to economic causes, and, therefore, proper and right, or whether due to manipulation or profiteering on the part of miners, shippers, or dealers in coal.

*Resolved further*, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized and directed to subpoena witnesses and compel their attendance, to send for persons and papers, and do such further acts as may be necessary to secure any and all information desired in the furtherance of said inquiry.

*Resolved further*, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce shall report its findings to the Senate, together with such recommendations as may be pertinent and advisable, with a view either to congressional or Executive action, in order to remedy existing conditions or the punishment of any individual or corporation deemed guilty of unlawful acts.

*Resolved further*, That the expense of the aforesaid inquiry be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

## DAYLIGHT-SAVING LAW.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I send to the Secretary's desk a short communication from the Farmers' Union and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

615 WOODWARD BUILDING,  
Washington, D. C., July 15, 1919.

DEAR SIR: We are glad that there is still a chance for the repeal of the daylight-saving law, as all farmers are interested in seeing this done at the earliest possible moment.

This is a question upon which the farmers are of one opinion. They are absolutely unanimous in their opposition to this law and have

been from the day it went into effect. It is not only a great inconvenience to them, but in many cases proves an absolute loss and waste to them.

The farmers were told during the war that they must expect to make greater sacrifices than any other class. They were practically the only business men who worked without a "cost plus" in some form. They were the only laborers who never went on a strike, no matter how long the hours or how little the pay. Now, the daylight-saving law, along with other things, has been instrumental in creating dissatisfaction among farm laborers. They have borne all this patiently up to the time when there can be no legitimate excuse for a continuance of such unjust legislation.

Farmers do not have access to the President as do the organizations that are advocating the continuance of this law. They feel sure that if the President was closer in touch with the situation and knew the hardships this law works upon them and that they are unanimously against it he would not want them to bear this unnecessary burden longer. You have been on the ground continuously and know the feeling of the farmers in this matter, and we feel that we may depend on you to see that this unjust and unnecessary law is repealed at once.

Very truly, yours,

JOHN A. SIMPSON,  
President.

E. A. CALVIN,  
Washington Representative,  
Association Farmers' Union Presidents.

## THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an article entitled "The league of nations," written by William H. Fleming, of Georgia. Mr. Fleming was formerly a Representative in the Congress of the United States. I served with him there either one or two terms, I have forgotten now which. He is a remarkably good lawyer and a very clear reasoner, and he has written an article which, I think, will aid the public and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to understand the legal situation with regard to the league of peace, especially upon the question of the surrender of sovereignty and independence, that has been so much argued; and I ask that it be inserted in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The matter referred to is as follows:

## THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

(By William H. Fleming, former Congressman Tenth District of Georgia.)

We people in America did not pay the price nor bear the agony of France and Belgium and England and Italy in the World War. Yet the pages of history afford no nobler example of devotion to liberty, of loyalty to humanity, of service to brother man, and of duty to God than when America pledged her life, her fortune, and her sacred honor that the Hun should not crush out our Christian civilization.

Victory has been achieved, but not without the sacrifice of seven and a half million of human lives and a waste of wealth almost inconceivable.

Some of the leading statesmen of the world met at the Paris conference, and many other statesmen who were not there lent their counsel and advice—notable among the number being Hon. William Howard Taft, whose noble patriotism leaves no place for narrow partisanship. Under the direction of these leading minds, hundreds of experts, embracing every line of industry, of politics, of law and of government, labored for months. As a result of their work and wisdom, in dealing with the most difficult and complicated situation that ever faced any set of men, a treaty of peace has been formulated. That treaty has been signed by the delegates at Versailles and awaits only formal ratification by the proper authorities of the nations involved in the conflict.

Under our Government it is the prerogative of the United States Senate to act upon all treaties when presented to it by the President. That body is now asked by some of its Members to reject this treaty of peace, or to so amend it as to block its present operation, and thus delay the return of peace to an anxious and suffering world.

Some of these opponents of ratification are men of high position in our public life. They must have some reasons, more or less satisfactory to themselves, for their obstructive action at this critical stage.

Evidently we can not afford to oppose ratification on the mere authority of the great names appearing among the obstructionists—for if we accept that principle for our guidance, we are met with the authority of still greater names in favor of ratifying the treaty. We, the people, must therefore examine for ourselves into the validity of the objections.

## LEAGUE OF NATIONS PROPERLY EMBODIED IN TREATY OF PEACE.

In the first place, and regardless of its provisions, we are told that the league of nations ought not to have been embodied in the treaty of peace.

This criticism, when subjected to analysis, appears illogical to the extent almost of insincerity. Of course any man who really believes that concerted action by the civilized nations of the world to enforce peace is in itself an undesirable and

abominable thing is fully justified in saying that the league ought not to have been embraced in the treaty. That man is opposed to the league in the treaty or out of it.

But taking it for granted, as we surely may, that the league to enforce peace is a thing to be desired, as a forward step in the higher development of world affairs, by which peace-loving democracies may combine their powers to protect themselves and weaker peoples against aggression of war-loving nations, then it is patent that to have neglected to take advantage of the one great opportunity presented by the peace conference at Paris would have been almost a crime. At the least, it would have been a blunder in diplomatic strategy, and we have the saying of a famous French diplomat that in such matters a blunder is worse than a crime.

Had not The Hague Tribunal labored for years in vain to get unity of action for peace among the nations? Did not Germany thwart every effort in that direction, because she was confident of her superior power and intended to bring on a war of conquest for her own aggrandizement?

But the developments of the war brought about a sudden change in the attitude of nations in regard to this issue. When Prussianism was in defeat, and all the peoples of central Europe, exhausted in man power and in wealth, stood aghast at the unspeakable horrors of the bloody conflict, it was then that the world, as never before, was ready to listen to those men of vision who pleaded that the powers of righteousness should combine against the powers of evil, and thus promote the happiness and prosperous development of both good and bad.

Such an opportunity to serve mankind would probably not have come again in a hundred years. We should be thankful that our President had the intuition of genius to seize the occasion for the accomplishment of this great mission, and also that he had the moral courage to stand by his convictions.

With confident assurance we may accept it as a fortunate fact that the league of nations was put in the right place at the right time.

The founding of this league of nations will, no doubt, be held by students of history in future years as one of the great blessings of the World War that balances off to some extent its terrible evils of suffering and loss.

#### THE LEAGUE AND THE CONSTITUTION.

Again, we are told by some of those conscientious objectors in the Senate and out of it that our Constitution forbids our entering into such a league.

From the beginning of our Government we have had much discussion about the proper location of the dividing line between State rights and National rights under our Constitution, but by no possibility can that time-worn issue be dragged into the consideration of the acceptance or rejection of the treaty of peace.

The Constitution itself expressly says in Article I, section 10, paragraph 1, that no State shall "enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation."

The full power of treaty making is vested in the President and the Senate, acting by a two-thirds vote of those present. (Art. II, sec. 2, par. 2.) In our foreign relations States are unknown. Abroad there is but one flag, the flag of the Union.

The Supreme Court of the United States, speaking through Justice Field in 133 United States, page 266, says that the treaty power extends "to all proper subjects of negotiation" between our Government and the Governments of other nations. After stating that a treaty can not do what the Constitution forbids, nor change the nature of the National Government nor of the State government, nor cede any portion of the territory of a State without its consent, Justice Field adds:

But with these exceptions it is not perceived that there is any limit to the questions that can be adjusted touching any matter which is properly the subject of negotiation with a foreign country.

Thomas Jefferson is on record as holding that the treaty-making power extends to all subjects "usually regulated by treaty."

However, if the authority of the Supreme Court and of Thomas Jefferson fails to carry conviction to any adherent of the doctrine of State rights, surely such adherent will not question the authority of John C. Calhoun, the most profound and logical expounder of the Constitution as related to that doctrine.

When Mr. Calhoun was Secretary of State under President Tyler, he addressed a letter on June 28, 1844, to Mr. Wheaton, then American minister to Prussia, in which he used the following language:

The treaty-making power has indeed been regarded to be so comprehensive as to embrace, with few exceptions, all questions that can possibly arise between ourselves and other nations, and which can only be adjusted by their mutual consent, whether the subject matter be comprised among the delegated or reserved powers.

The framers of our Constitution have not deserved the praise heaped upon them by historians and statesmen if a defect should now be discovered in that document which compels us to refuse cooperation in the greatest organized movement ever undertaken for the welfare of mankind. They made no such blunder, and we wear no such shackles.

#### OUR TREATY WITH PANAMA.

Following up the general objection as to the unconstitutionality of the treaty and the league, the critics specify by alleging that we have no constitutional right to stand sponsor for the liberty or independence of any foreign nation, and that such action would be without precedent.

In answer, let us look to the record.

On November 18, 1903, Hon. John Hay, our Secretary of State, signed a convention with the Republic of Panama for the construction of the ship canal; on February 23, 1904, ratification was advised by the Senate, and on February 26, 1904, proclamation of the treaty was duly made. The very first article of that treaty reads as follows:

The United States guarantees, and will maintain, the independence of the Republic of Panama.

If we had the constitutional power to guarantee the independence of Panama, why have we not the same power to cooperate with other leading nations of the world to guarantee the independence of Belgium and Poland and other members of the league? Evidently it is not a question of power but of policy.

#### THE LEAGUE AND AMERICANISM.

But the point about which the enemies of the league seem to concentrate their heaviest artillery is article 10, which reads as follows:

The members of the league undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the league. In case of any such aggression, or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression, the council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled.

We are told by some of these objectors that such a covenant is un-American; that it is a surrender of American sovereignty; and that no red-blooded American should submit to it, and so forth. And one excited alarmist in the Senate has sworn an oath that he would not vote for the treaty even though Christ himself should approve it.

#### ROOSEVELT FAVORED ARTICLE 10.

In the midst of these direful forebodings we can derive some comfort at least by turning to the words of a man whose red-blooded Americanism no one can doubt, and whose standard, ever in the front of the battle like the white plume of Navarre, was the political rallying point for millions of his devoted countrymen.

When President Roosevelt had been awarded the Nobel peace prize for his great service in bringing about the peace of Portsmouth, between Russia and Japan, and had returned from his trip to Africa, and was making his triumphal journey through Europe, he went to Christiania, Norway, to receive his distinguished honor in formal manner from the hands of the Nobel peace committee.

The date was May 5, 1910. His audience was the world. The occasion was one that will be ever memorable in history. The opportunity called for the best of truth and wisdom that was in the heart and head of this orator-statesman from America. He rose to the situation then, full of pure patriotism and free of petty partisanship.

He made two carefully prepared addresses. In one he spoke thus:

In the end I firmly believe that some method will be devised by which the people of the world as a whole will be able to insure peace as it can not now be insured.

How soon that end will come I do not know; it may be far distant, and until it does come I think that while we should give all the support that we can to any possible feasible scheme for quickly bringing about such a state of affairs, yet we should meanwhile do the more practicable, though less sensational things.

Let us advance step by step; let us, for example, endeavor to increase the number of arbitration treaties and enlarge the methods for obtaining peaceful settlements. Above all, let us strive to awaken the public international conscience, so that it shall be expected, and expected efficiently, of the public men responsible for the management of any nation's affairs, that those affairs shall be conducted with all proper regard for the interests and well being of other powers, great or small.

There we heard him appealing to the conscience of the world, as we so often heard him appeal to the conscience of America.

In his other address he was even more definite in its application to present world conditions, and said:

Finally, it would be a master stroke if these great powers bent on peace would form a league of peace, not only to keep the peace among themselves, but to prevent by force, if necessary, its being broken by others.



After reading those brave words let no American who believed in Roosevelt consent to striking out article 10 from the league of nations. We might well charge that article 10 was paraphrased from the speech of this great American.

ROOSEVELT FORETELLS THE COMING OF WILSON.

But again, and chiefly, as if touched with the spirit of prophecy, Mr. Roosevelt said:

As things are now, such power to command peace throughout the world could best be assured by some combination between those great nations which sincerely desire peace and have no thought themselves of committing aggressions.

The combination might at first be only to secure peace within certain definite limits and certain definite conditions; but the ruler or statesman who would bring about such a combination would have earned his place in history for all time, and his title to the gratitude of mankind.

It is no reflection on Mr. Roosevelt for us of this day to suggest that perhaps he thought it possible sufficient years were left to him to win again the Presidency of the United States, and from that vantage point of power realize in himself his vision of that coming statesman.

Fate dashed his hopes. Death closed his eyes upon that entrancing prospect. But his prophecy was fulfilled in Woodrow Wilson, the veritable man he foretold, who has, indeed, "earned his place in history for all time and his title to the gratitude of mankind."

WM. H. FLEMING.

AUGUSTA, GA., July 2, 1919.

ALSATIAN POTASH.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I send to the desk a copy of the magazine called "Victory—An Illustrated Magazine of Franco-American Relations," and I ask that a short article contained in it on Alsatian products be printed in the Record, for the information of the Senate.

I do not know how many Senators here have been importuned by their former constituents to do something in relation to the present situation as to the price of potash; but at the present time the farmers are compelled to pay an exceedingly high price for potash. I understand that there is an embargo against Alsatian potash, formerly German potash, now under the control of France, and it has been stated that the price of potash has been inordinately high on account of this embargo. The statement has also been made that France could not supply us with potash for several years. This article gives certain facts and contradicts the impression which has been gained that potash could not be imported from France. If something could be done to satisfy the industry here in America and at the same time release this potash for importation, the farmers of the country would be greatly benefited.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order that those interested in the subject may be informed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have no objection to the article being printed, but I wish to ask the Senator what he means by "something being done" for the producers of potash here? Does he mean that he wants a duty placed upon the importation of potash, so as to make it more expensive to the farmers than it otherwise would be?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. No. I want the embargo at the present time placed upon the importation of potash by the War Trade Board taken off.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that that has been done.

Mr. LODGE. No.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The embargo has been raised. At least, I saw a publication in the Washington Post the other day to that effect. I do not know—nobody can believe anything he sees in a newspaper, necessarily—but if not done it soon will be, and if any request of ours will help to do it, all the better, of course.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I will say to the Senator that I have requested not only the War Trade Board but the Department of Agriculture to do something in the matter.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, my information is that the Senator from Mississippi is in error about potash being taken off the embargo list. I think it is included in the embargo.

Mr. LODGE. It certainly is. So are dyestuffs.

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; so are dyestuffs. I think the Senator from New Jersey is entirely right. We ought to take that embargo off and let the foreign potash come in.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It states that dyestuffs from Germany and potash from Saxony were not released from the embargo, but the Alsatian potash was. I may be mistaken.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If the Senator from Mississippi will read the article, he will ascertain that the principal supply of potash will come from Alsace; and, if the embargo is lifted, our farmers in this country, instead of paying \$170 a ton for potash, which they need for the production of their crops, will be paying \$50 or \$60 a ton.

Mr. WILLIAMS. When was that article written?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. July, 1919, this month.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is the date of publication; but when was it written? Does the Senator know?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I do not know.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am inclined to think it was written about the close of the war. But whether that is true or not, the resolution can not do any harm. It is of the utmost importance to the cotton planters very much more than anybody else, because they use more potash in proportion to hydrogen and other fertilizers than do almost any other producers of plants.

Mr. SMOOT. Potash is to be discussed in the near future in the House of Representatives. If there is any duty placed upon it, it must originate there. I am not going to object to this article going in the Record; but I wish to say that the farmers may be able to buy potash a little cheaper if the embargo is lifted and the importation allowed to come into this country free of duty until the American industry is destroyed that has been established in the production of potash in this country. But after that happens I do not know whether they will be able to buy it for any less than they are buying it to-day or not.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I wish I really thought there has been a potash industry successfully established in this country. I am looking for the facts. I hope it has been done, but I am a little afraid it has not.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator it has been successfully established; I have not any doubt of it; and if an embargo were placed on potash importations I think within the next 12 months there would be potash produced in this country sufficient for its needs. I have not the time, I will say to the Senator—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The prices which the producers of potash we are talking about are asking to be paid are exorbitant.

Mr. SMOOT. That came about because of the fact that the war was on, and every country wanted unusual quantities of potash for munition purposes. They required the potash, and it made no difference what price the producer asked, it was paid. But that is not what the American producer is expecting in the future. The American producers expect to make a business of it in this country and to produce potash sufficient for the needs of the country, and if we allow them a fair chance I have no doubt they will produce it at a fair price.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I merely wish to suggest to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], with reference to the first resolution which he introduced, that if the Senate is going to inquire particularly into the high cost of all the articles which we are now consuming, we will have nothing much to do but that. The price of coal is high because every basic element that enters into the cost of coal is high. Wages have been increased. The price of steel has been very largely increased. Everything that the coal producer has to buy has largely increased in cost, but more particularly wages have increased. The same thing has happened with reference to coal that has happened with reference to cotton, cotton oil, and with reference to everything the farmer produces. I am quite sure the Senator has no objection if investigation is to be made along these lines that it should include the entire subject of the high cost of living at this particular time and not one particular subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to printing in the Record the article referred to by the Senator from New Jersey? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

(From Victory for July, 1919.)

"ALSATIAN POTASH.

"Since the signing of the armistice it seems that a campaign has been carried on in America against the importation of potash from Alsace. This campaign is of more or less German origin, although some of its leaders maintain that we must not deal with Germany, and others that American industry would suffer; finally some say that France would not have enough potash for home consumption if we permitted its importation.

"A quick survey of the question will show that the real situation is quite different from that which is presented in certain American newspapers.

"I.—Potash industry in America.

"BEFORE THE WAR—GERMAN IMPORTS.

"The potash industry began in the United States in 1914. Before that date Germany was the chief potash-producing country. In 1913 the Kalis Syndicate had extracted, from the Stassfurt mines alone, 11,800,000 tons of crude salts and had manufactured 1,650,000 tons of concentrated salts. When the war came the cessation of the importation of potash was a great blow to

America, which, before the war, had made use of a fleet of 250 steamships for the sole purpose of importing potash from Germany.

"In view of the fact that the price of potash rose to 2,000 and 2,500 francs a ton for chloride of potassium, as compared with a former price of 195 francs, American business men realized how hard it was to have to depend upon the outside world for essential products.

"Before the war the amount of potash used in the United States was as follows: In 1910, 244,900 tons; in 1912, 216,000 tons; in 1913, 231,000 tons.

"Every year about 220,000 tons were used in agriculture and 10,000 tons in chemical industries. This potash was furnished almost entirely by Germany, and the value of imports in 1913 reached \$18,073,685. In 1914 only 207,000 tons were imported; in 1915 the amount dropped to 134,000 tons.

"DURING THE WAR—AMERICAN PRODUCTION.

"During the war the production of American potash amounted in 1916 to 35,739 short tons; in 1917 to 126,961 short tons; in 1918 to 192,587 short tons. It was obtained from different sources—from the salt waters of Searles Lake, from California, and from the lakes of Nebraska; also from the dust of cement furnaces and from seaweed along the Pacific coast. Some have even attempted to produce potash as a by-product in beet-sugar refining. One company, the Oxnard Sugar Factory, manufactured 100 tons in this way in 1918.

"All these processes, however, are very costly and were only developed in consequence of the practically entire suppression of imports; in 1917 imports amounted only to 8,100 tons, sources being as follows: Russia, 17 per cent; Chili, 17 per cent; England, 15 per cent; Italy, 10 per cent; Japan, 14 per cent; other countries, 32 per cent.

"The importation of potash from France was very small before the war and fell from 1,000 tons, worth \$84,400 in 1914, to 83 tons, worth \$5,200 in 1915.

"PRESENT SITUATION AND FUTURE NEEDS.

"Since the signing of the armistice, because of the drop in price of potash, certain American processes of manufacture have been abandoned. It was due to this that two companies failed—the Diamond Match Co. and the Hercules Powder Co., both of whom extracted potash from seaweed and sea wrack.

"II.—Actual conditions in the German potash industry.

"Germany, in spite of the loss of Alsace-Lorraine, remains, because of the importance of the Stassfurt mines, a formidable opponent.

"In December, 1918, the Minister of Agriculture in Washington gave out that 'even under the most favorable conditions it would be impossible to obtain French potash in the United States before June 1.' This statement, which can easily be explained by the change in régime of the Alsace-Lorraine mines, was exaggerated by the Germans, and on January 17 a dispatch of the Associated Press announced that because of the needs of France no authorization for importing Alsatian potash into the United States could be obtained for two or three years at least. This statement is not based upon facts.

"Besides, the manufacturers of the State of Nebraska tried to put an obstacle in the way of shipments of 500,000 to 600,000 tons of potash which were to have been sent to the United States in the ships that returned from France.

"The total German production of 1917 was 1,004,285 tons, as compared with 1,110,274 tons in 1914; however, the loss of the Alsatian mines will reduce these figures. On the other hand, German consumption has enormously increased. Germany, therefore, will not be able to export any potash unless she greatly increases the production of the Stassfurt Basin, which, before the war, was already being worked to its full extent.

"III.—The Alsatian Basin.

"In 1869 rock salt was discovered at Dornach, near Mulhausen; however, it was not until 35 years later, in 1904, that three Alsations formed a company to develop the resources of sea coal and petroleum in the valley of Nonnenbruch. Rock salt was discovered at a depth of 358 meters; then, at 645 and 725 meters, two layers that were recognized as being potash.

"Finally, this potash bed was found to extend over approximately 200 square kilometers, mostly under the forest of Nonnenbruch, northwest of Mulhausen.

"Its depth varies from 500 meters in the south to 800 meters in the north. According to calculations based upon these investigations, the entire bed includes 1,472,000,000 tons of useful products, of which at least 300,000,000 tons are pure potash. These mines cover an area extending from the foothills of the Vosges to Mulhausen, Cerny, and Soultz.

"The Industrial Society of Mulhausen has figured that the lower layer of potash covers 172,000,000 square meters and the

upper layer 84,000,000 square meters—in a word, that the total production would amount to nearly 70,000,000,000 francs.

"The Alsatian salts are greatly superior in quality to those of Stassfurt; the latter need to be put through an expensive process in order to separate the chloride of potassium from the chloride of magnesium. The Alsatian mineral contains no magnesium. It is necessary merely to crush the mineral when it comes from the mines in order to obtain salts for agriculture.

"The consumption of potash salt in France will undoubtedly increase in the future, and the development of the Alsace-Lorraine potash beds will permit France to play an important rôle among potash-exporting countries.

"In 1914 the output of the Alsace-Lorraine beds was more than 40,000 tons, and this was far from representing the possible output, for the Germans did not wish to make Alsace-Lorraine a serious competitor of the Stassfurt mines. Thus the owners of the latter mines succeeded in reducing the Alsatian output to a minimum and to keep prices high by this means.

"German propaganda in the United States has attempted to spread the idea that France would be opposed to the export of Alsatian potash, especially to the United States.

"IV.—France offers to ship potash to the United States.

"Because of all the facts above mentioned, the idea prevails in the United States that France refuses to allow the exportation of potash. This idea is false. A telegram from President Wilson, dated April 28, announces that 'France offers to ship potash to the United States' under conditions favorable to America, where the price of potash has risen six times as high as that paid for German potash before the war.

"In 1916 a representative of the American Potash Syndicate maintained that the price of potash, extracted from the lakes of Nebraska, could advantageously compete with prices of German potash in America before the war. He tried to prove that potash sold at from \$20 to \$40 a ton. But a recent statement of potash producers shows that the real price is double this, or four times the price of Alsatian potash that was sent to Rotterdam.

"Therefore, for 10 years the United States has sustained an enormous loss in order to encourage the development of potash in America; and for 4 years this industry has been allowed to develop freely, without competition, under shelter of a protecting tariff. Capital has easily been procured to build factories, but most of them have failed. More than 100 licenses have been taken out, but none has had real commercial value.

"The French Government is considering sending Alsatian potash by boat, via Rouen to Havre; moreover, they contemplate sending a qualified Alsatian representative to organize sales upon arrangement with American business houses.

"V.—Conclusion.

"Alsatian potash imported to the United States will, therefore, be three times less expensive than that produced here. Unless the price of American potash is greatly reduced (which is hardly likely) it will be profitable to only a small number of producers to prohibit the importation of the Alsatian product. To do so would be contrary to the interests of agriculturists, farmers, and general consumers; in a word, to practically the entire population of the United States, since the fall in price of articles of primary importance, such as cotton, fruits, cereals, tobacco, potatoes, etc., depends upon the abundance of crops.

"In closing we may state that the exportation of Alsatian potash is one of the means that will permit France to pay for a part of the articles she receives from America, and that in this way it will stimulate the foreign commerce of the United States."

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have a very short article, written by Frederic R. Coudert, the very worthy son of a very noble sire. The article is entitled "The League Basis for a Better World System." I request that it be inserted in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none. It is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

THE LEAGUE BASIS FOR A BETTER WORLD SYSTEM.  
(By Frederic R. Coudert.)

[The following clear and brief outline of reasons why the people of the United States should support the plan for a league of nations now before the Paris conference is contributed to this magazine by an authority of recognized international distinction.]

"I.

"The league is the result of the logic of events rather than of the will of statesmen or of the theories of political philosophers. Nationalism, in many respects a beneficent principle, is also in many cases a disruptive force. It succeeded to and replaced those traditions of European unity embodied in the concept of the Roman Imperium. The national movement slowly develop-



ing through the eighteenth century and breaking out with fury during the French Revolution, led, like the Reformation, to a quarter of a century of war. Present conditions in Europe are calculated to lead to indefinite warfare in the attempt to realize national aspirations. Such warfare can only be avoided by co-operative action upon the part of the great nations. Necessary self-interest at a time of continuing peril dictates a permanent league of nations as in similar fashion the temporary union of free democratic peoples was essential to save civilization from the assault of Prussianism.

#### " II.

"The instinct of peoples the world over understands this necessity. Two powerful forces or ideas are at work—that which makes for national self-consciousness and that which aims at a wider organization of humanity. They are the two great dynamic forces of world politics to-day. Nationality must be recognized and its rights asserted and maintained not by an appeal to force but to the association of nations which, having recognized in principle the justice of those claims, is now creating a mechanism for overcoming the difficulties incident to their just application.

#### " III.

"The league of nations has been injured by its more enthusiastic adherents who, in declaring that it will end war and inaugurate the millennium, play into the hands of its enemies.

"What it can do and will do is to adopt federation as a working principle under which the nations may maintain their national existence without necessary recourse to war. This principle has made America what it is; its application can alone save Europe from an indefinite vista of conflict.

#### " IV.

"The pivot upon which the league of nations must mainly revolve is the solidarity of the English-speaking Commonwealths. With France we will always have close, sympathetic, cooperative relations. No greater task devolves upon the American citizen to-day than to strive for good fellowship with those who have the same language, the same common law, kindred institutions, a common consciousness of right and wrong, and whose combined power in men and resources could defy militant aggression from almost any combination of powers seeking world domination by force.

#### " V.

"The United States can not live and, in fact, never has lived in isolation. The Seven Years' War, as well as those wars incident to the French Revolution and Napoleon, involved the American Colonies and the American Nation. That we can be indifferent to nothing which threatens world strife the war has proved. Our undivided duty is to work for the Federal principle and its practical application, through methods which will ever grow by practice and experience more efficient.

#### " VI.

"Thus the success of the league of nations already existent will depend most largely upon American opinion. It is the duty of all interested in bringing about a better world system to educate that opinion and to create a 'state of mind' favorable to international cooperation. In order that this may be effected, partisanship must be eliminated, superficial objections answered, erroneous ideas of national sovereignty, mostly 'made in Germany,' put aside, and moral and intellectual approval of the Nation marshaled behind its President spokesman in the superb and inspiring attempt in applying the federative principle on a world scale to bring about a better system and a firmer foundation for international law and morality. The doctrine of sovereignty was never carried so far as by the Prussian State; it defeated its own end.

#### " VII.

"The draft approved by the conference at Versailles for the constitution of a league of nations embodies the best attainable in the present condition of opinion.

"1. It provides for a permanent organization always ready to function.

"2. It makes provision for a taboo or 'outlawry' of any nation refusing to abide its decision.

"3. It furnishes machinery for solving one of the world's fundamental difficulties—to wit, the exploitation of undeveloped peoples.

"4. The difference between the proposed plan and the mere opportunity for arbitration afforded by The Hague Conference is, of course, fundamental. The latter assists the established practices of arbitration and aims at some codification of international law, while the proposed league institutes a new world order designed to correct the inherent disruptive tendencies inevitable in the system of theoretical, sovereign, independent, unrelated nations.

"5. Above all, it places preponderant power in the hands of the world's great democracies and gives to France, the United States, Great Britain, and Italy an influence which can always be decisive against predatory power under whatever forms disguised. The agreed plan marks a capital event in history and furnishes a basis for infinite development toward international cooperation and the marshaling of material and moral force behind law. World opinion is at last given an organ of expression. The part of America in bringing about this result is one for just patriotic congratulation.

"6. The Monroe doctrine announced to the world that the United States would protect the integrity of South American States against foreign aggression. The league extends that principle of protection to all nations. The rights of the United States are not impaired; the guaranties of the States of South America are strengthened. It is a misapprehension of the meaning of the Monroe doctrine to believe it endangered by the proposed plan.

"President Monroe defined his own doctrine as follows:

"We owe it, therefore, to candor, and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those (European) powers, to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere. But with the Governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of suppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as a manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

"One of the latest official exponents of the doctrine, President Theodore Roosevelt, so defined it:

"The Monroe doctrine should be the cardinal feature of the foreign policy of all the nations in the two Americas, as it is of the United States. \* \* \* The Monroe doctrine is a declaration that there must be no territorial aggrandizement by any non-American power at the expense of any American power on American soil. It is in no wise intended as hostile to any nation in the Old World. Still less is it intended to give cover to any aggression by one New World power at the expense of any other. It is simply a step, and a long step, toward assuring the universal peace of the world by securing the possibility of permanent peace on this hemisphere. During the past century other influences have established the permanence and the independence of the smaller States of Europe. Through the Monroe doctrine we hope to be able to safeguard like independence and secure like permanence for the lesser among the New World nations.

"I know of no more completely adequate or satisfactory definition.

"Senator Root has lucidly defined the now traditional doctrine, as follows:

"It is the substance of the thing to which the Nation holds, and that is and always has been, that the safety of the United States demands that American territory shall remain American.

"The Monroe doctrine does not assert or imply or involve any right on the part of the United States to impair or control the independent sovereignty of any American State. The declaration of Monroe was that the rights and interests of the United States were involved in maintaining a condition, and the condition to be maintained was the independence of all the American countries. \* \* \* We frequently see statements that the doctrine has been changed or enlarged; that there is a new or different doctrine since Monroe's time. They are mistaken. There has been no change. One apparent extension of the statement of Monroe was made by President Polk. \* \* \* All assertions to the contrary notwithstanding, there has been no other change or enlargement of Monroe's doctrine since it was first promulgated.

"7. Those who oppose a league in principle are, in large part, the men who obstructed America's entrance into the World War on the theory of 'isolation' or unconcern with the affairs of other nations; a theory never true to the facts and absurd in this century, in which nothing is so impossible to conceive as a lotus-eating America 'careless of mankind.' The experience of the Great War has killed the theory, save in the most parochial-minded. This is no time for 'little Americans.'

"8. On the other hand, there are those in and out of the Senate who, while honestly favoring a league of nations, attack the proposed plan upon the ground that it would require the sending of American troops to take part in Europe's struggles. While this appears to us a parochial view overlooking changed world conditions, which necessitate action on the part of America to maintain peace in a world which modern methods of transportation have made comparatively small, we think that an extension of the very valuable plan of mandatory control would meet the objection, as far as it has any foundation, by dividing the world into four zones, one of which would be the Western Hemisphere, in which the United States, acting in accordance with the league's mandate, could intervene when anarchic or other conditions threatened world peace. The United States, as in the case of the Philippines, has never hesitated in its willingness to give an account of its political stewardship.

"9. Inaction would be fatal. Some means to solve pending problems must be found. The mass of mankind ardently desires something that may save civilization from war or anarchy. Leaders of opinion can not be dumb to the clamor of world

anguish. The present proposed constitution of a league of nations, with slight modifications not inconsistent with its announced principles and with a revision clarifying some of its clauses, would be the greatest advance yet made by mankind on the long, cruel road from the reign of force and fraud toward that of law and peace."

#### SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill (H. R. 7343) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. WARREN. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be read for amendments only.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I think I ought to say that the only changes in the former bill are to one part of one section. One change simply strikes out \$6,000,000 and inserts \$8,000,000, on page 43, and the other change strikes out, on the same page, the item in which the original members of the Federal Board were included with others in the limitation of salaries. Those are the only two changes that occur in the bill as it was originally passed through both bodies.

I have been asked a number of questions regarding the amounts made available for the vocational educational problem altogether. I desire to say that to this \$8,000,000 may be added the \$6,000,000 passed in the special bill which came from the Committee on Education and Labor. There was also \$3,500,000, or a little more, for the current year provided for in the original bill and its amendments providing for the educational rehabilitation problem, and there is \$5,500,000 in the Army bill. So the whole amount passed at this time and available for the current year is \$23,000,000.

The veto of the President was based upon something like 4,000 soldiers now under care of this agency and 4,000 more who will have to be taken on, and he asked for an addition of \$2,000,000. The House has provided even more than that—\$14,000,000 more, carried in the two bills.

As to the limitation of salaries, I have here a list of the changes that have been made. Several Members of the House have told me that the Vocational Board is entirely satisfied with the list as finally arranged, and that will be shown by reading the printed report of the hearings. While it provides very liberally for 288 in place of 307, starting at \$6,000 and the lowest man getting \$2,500, yet there is saved in this list \$94,080. The 288 men will get from \$2,500 to \$6,000 and there is no limit as to how many they may employ under \$2,500 per annum.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I did not quite understand the Senator. Do I understand his position to be that there is no limitation upon the amount that may be utilized of this appropriation for the payment of employees and no limit upon the number of employees?

Mr. WARREN. The limit is as I stated. The balance of it is, of course, subject to the judgment and determination of the board as to how many, if any, they shall employ. They have at present employed, as I understand it and as the evidence seems to show, 307, but they felt that they could cut that number to 288.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It is very difficult to hear what the Senator says, and I am very much interested in his statement.

Mr. WARREN. I was saying that they have employed 307 men, whose total salaries amount to \$941,580. The list was gone over at the hearings and the secretary of the board has assured me that this schedule of 288 men has been accepted by the board as satisfactory. All the 288 men receive salaries of \$2,500 or more, and the necessary employment of additional men can be made at figures less than \$2,500 each.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Appropriations Committee decided that they would offer no amendment to the bill, and the bill as now reported is the bill as it passed the House. I want to take just a short time of the Senate to discuss some features of the bill, particularly the appropriation that has been referred to by the chairman of the committee.

The chairman is correct in saying that there has been appropriated with the amount carried in the pending bill \$23,000,000 to cover all the activities of the Federal Board for Vocational Education, both in the direct appropriation for that board and the appropriation through the Army appropriation bill. I want to say in the beginning that this \$23,000,000 is not going to be sufficient to pay the expenses that will be incurred the coming year. We might just as well know it now as later in the year.

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask the Senator right there what his estimate of the deficiency will be?

Mr. SMOOT. The estimate by the officials of the bureau is that there will be \$11,000,000 deficiency.

Mr. THOMAS. I suppose it is safe to assume it will be a good deal more than that.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no doubt at all in my mind but what it will be.

So far as the object of the legislation is concerned, nobody can find fault with it. If the money was to be expended in a way that no criticism could be offered of it, and if it were expended primarily for the soldier himself, I doubt whether a soul would utter a word of objection. But if the reports are true that come to me, Mr. President, this bill is not altogether a bill for the rehabilitation of soldiers. It is also a bill intended to rehabilitate superannuated professors and school-teachers from one end of the country to the other. The proposed organization on July 1, 1919, was as the chairman of the committee said—

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Does the Senator mean that they are to be rehabilitated financially under the terms of the bill?

Mr. SMOOT. That is exactly what I mean.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If the Senator will pardon me, if he means that incompetent, broken-down teachers are to be employed at good salaries, I think the Senator is mistaken about it.

Mr. SMOOT. If I am informed correctly, a great many of these teachers are now here in the District of Columbia awaiting the passage of the bill, and if I am informed correctly there have been letters sent to all the States of the Union asking for a list of teachers that they can get who are not employed at this time, who could be used in this service. I have not seen those letters, but I am told by a man who has been interested in this legislation that that is the case, and that they have a great number of them in the District of Columbia now waiting to be employed as soon as the President signs this bill.

Mr. KENYON. May I ask the Senator who sent the letters?

Mr. SMOOT. I think the Senator would know just as much about who sent them out as I would.

Mr. KENYON. Would it be Dr. Prosser?

Mr. SMOOT. I can not say whether he signed the letters or not, but the Senator knows himself that there have been letters sent throughout the country asking for such information.

Mr. KENYON. I heard the Senator from Utah say that, and he is generally correct, and, of course, I would be inclined to accept his statement at this time, but I would like to bring out who is accused of doing that and find out about it.

Mr. SMOOT. I have not seen the letters, but I have been told they were sent out by a man who has been interested in the advancement of this legislation.

Mr. President, it is true that in the organization as proposed on July 1, 1919, there were to be 307 employees receiving salaries all the way from \$2,500 to \$10,000. I have the list showing the number of employees comprising the 307 and the compensation to be paid to each grade.

The committee in the House took this question up and agreed, as I am informed, with the officials of the bureau to a reorganization as reported in this bill, and the number receiving above \$2,500 has been cut from 307 to 288. There is no limit in this bill as to the number of teachers who can be employed at \$2,475—

Mr. THOMAS. Or \$2,499?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes, or \$2,499, as the Senator suggests. The sky is the only limit. Of all the legislative bills that have been presented to Congress that open the door wide to pay any salary below \$2,500 out of a lump-sum appropriation, this bill and its companions are the limit. There is no particular amount named that shall be paid for salaries. It can all be paid for salaries under this appropriation. No amount is set aside for the expenses. All is to be paid out of one lump sum, to be handled exactly in the way that the officials of the bureau may desire. Prof. Branch, of Chicago, Ill., the head of the Branch School of Engineers at Chicago, was in Washington when this bill was under consideration before. Prof. Branch was one of the men at the first meeting in Washington at the time Dr. Prosser arranged for the meeting of certain professors throughout the country for the purpose of proposing this legislation.

Prof. Branch tells me that at that meeting the program was mapped out and certain schools of the country selected where this education should take place, and it was agreed at that meeting, he informs me, that the schools should receive their proportion of the soldiers based upon their ability to handle



them or the room that they might have to accommodate them. The professor came to Washington a short time ago, protesting against the agreement not being carried out. I asked him in what way, and he said that the Branch School of Engineers, of Chicago, Ill., up to that time had not had one soldier assigned to it; and, on the other hand, Dr. Prosser assigned to the school in which he was interested, namely, the Dunwoody Institute, in Minnesota, nearly 4,000 soldiers.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Did Prof. Branch make that statement to the Senator?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; he made that statement to me.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then I have very little confidence in anything that he says.

Mr. SMOOT. Prof. Branch told me that he had offered to take students at \$15 per month and that Dr. Prosser was charging \$50 a month for every soldier.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. KENYON. If the Senator is sure of his facts it is a very serious charge. I had heard those charges around the Capitol—

Mr. SMOOT. I asked Prof. Branch to go to see you at 9.30 o'clock one morning and tell his story to you.

Mr. KENYON. He did spend an hour and a half with me, and then I followed the story up, because it was a shocking thing to me that such a thing should go on. Does the Senator understand that Dr. Prosser, on this statement of Mr. Branch or any other information the Senator has, had these men in the Dunwoody Institute after he became connected with the Vocational Board?

Mr. SMOOT. Prof. Branch did not tell me what time they began assigning to his school, and therefore I can not say. I am not going to say anything except just what Prof. Branch told me.

Mr. KENYON. I know, but these are pretty serious charges against a man like Dr. Prosser, and if they are true, Dr. Prosser ought to go.

Mr. SMOOT. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. KENYON. As I understand the facts, if the Senator will allow me to state them—

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly; I shall be glad to have the Senator state them.

Mr. KENYON. Before Dr. Prosser became a member of the board at all there were some 4,000 soldiers who had been sent to the Dunwoody Institute at different times for training—that is, for different kinds of positions with the Army. That was done by that institution, which is an endowed institution in Minnesota. Since that time and up to the present time I have a list of men who are at the Dunwoody Institute. The Senator from Georgia has one. At this time there are 44, and there is no such charge as \$50 a month made. The Senator from Georgia and myself, who do not stand for graft any more than anybody else, called these men and talked to them. I had heard of the Bliss Institute having received \$50 a month for tuition, which seemed to me to be an outrageous proposition. I have not yet substantiated that, but the contracts were made to pay for these soldiers' training on the basis of just what the institution charges others. The Senator, I am sure, is mistaken. I know the Senator is so fair that he would not want to make a charge against a man holding the important public position that Dr. Prosser does, with a clean life and character, reflecting upon him as it does, if it is not true.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly. The Senator knows me well enough to be sure of the fact I would not do that.

Mr. KENYON. I do. Upon what does the Senator base his statement that \$50 a month was paid in this Dunwoody Institute?

Mr. SMOOT. I said Prof. Branch told me, and I think he told the Senator, too. If he did not, he did not tell him all he told me. He said that there was \$50 a month charged in the Dunwoody Institute for every man who was sent to that institution. He also said that he had offered, and was ready, to take the same men or the same number of men into his institution for \$15 a month.

Mr. KENYON. He did, and I think Mr. Branch ought to have some of these men. I do not like the situation in that respect. But he did not know that the \$50 a month was charged. It is just like all these other rumors that float around, distorting people's characters. When I pinned him down to whether or not he knew, he said that he did not know, and I say it is not true.

Mr. SMOOT. He stated to me that he did know it, and he said they were getting \$50 a month.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Again he discredited himself by putting himself in the attitude of a man who states one thing that is absolutely false and is not to be believed in anything he says.

Mr. SMOOT. I will state my object in speaking about the matter. I do not want this board to start out with any such proposition as one of the men who was instrumental in providing for this very legislation said that it started with. I would not say a word to blacken the character of a single soul on earth; I know what false reports mean to men; but here was a man who attended the very first meeting, who was asked to attend that meeting here in Washington, and did so, and the program was mapped out, the policy was adopted of selecting where the soldiers should be sent, and every detail was agreed to beforehand, before they came to Congress to ask for this legislation.

If Prof. Branch has made statements such as I say he has, and I am quite sure the Senator from Iowa feels positive that he made the statements to me, he should not have a soldier sent to his institute if the statements are untrue.

Mr. KENYON. Will the Senator pardon me?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. KENYON. I do not want to see the Senator do any injustice to his informant. I think if we had taken him and pinned him right down to whether he knew this to be true, he would have stated that he did not, but he had heard it, as the Senator has heard it.

Mr. SMOOT. No; the Senator is wrong there, because I stood in the Senate hallway and listened to him, and I asked him to go to Mr. Goop, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House, and tell him the story he had told me, as the question was then to come before the Senate in the sundry civil appropriation bill, the bill that finally passed Congress on the 1st day of July. I asked him, "Am I at liberty to use this information?" He said, "Yes." And not only that, but he expressed an earnest desire that hearings should be had, and stated that he was perfectly willing to appear before a committee of the Senate and testify to these things.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, that raises a straight question of veracity. The Senator is a member of the Committee on Appropriations. So am I. Why not bring this man before the committee, and bring Dr. Prosser before the committee? This is a question of fact that is susceptible of proof. The information furnished me by the board is as follows:

Tuition for regular courses is free to residents of Minnesota.

Entrance fee, \$3.

When necessary to arrange a special course for a man or group of men because of their peculiar handicap or lack of previous preparation, 50 cents per day may be paid until such time as a man is qualified to enter upon a regular course offered by the institute.

Tuition rate for men outside the State varies from \$15 to \$20 per month, depending wholly on course.

If Mr. Branch is going around stating that Mr. Prosser is placing men in an institution with which he has been connected, and with which he has a nominal connection now, at \$50 a month tuition, that is a mighty serious charge.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what it is.

Mr. KENYON. And if it is true, I should say that the President of the United States, if he can, ought to request Mr. Prosser to resign. If it is not true, then the gentleman who makes these accusations ought to come here or before a committee and say that he has been mistaken.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, as I said before, I think that if Mr. Branch has made these statements, and they are not true, his institution should not be used in any way for the rehabilitation of our soldiers. I will go that far.

Mr. KENYON. If Mr. Branch makes the charges, let him come in and prove them, and "prove up or shut up" when he is assailing the character of a man like Dr. Prosser.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the Senator from Iowa is right. But, Mr. President, we can not wait for the passage of this bill upon that account. That can be done hereafter.

Mr. KENYON. I want to ask the Senator if he really believes now in his heart that these men were sent to the Dunwoody Institute when there are only 44 of them now, instead of 4,000? There have not been 5,200 in training at any time; so it is a perfectly ridiculous statement that 4,000 of them were receiving this training at Dunwoody Institute. Does he really believe that these men have been sent up there, and have paid \$50 a month?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, after what the Senator from Iowa has stated, I have my grave doubts of it; and I want the Senator from Iowa to understand that I have never yet made a statement in this connection based on my own knowledge. I took particular pains to say to the Senate that I was telling the Senate just what Prof. Branch had told me, and I was very anxious that he should tell Mr. Goop, of the House, and Mr. KENYON, of the Senate, just what he told me.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I want to say that I was very much impressed with his appearance and candor and intellectuality, and what he said about his school; and I am satisfied now that what he meant to convey to the Senator and to me was that he had heard that this had been done, but that he was in no sense stating it as a fact.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator that he told me this: He said, "It is nothing more or less than paying \$35 a month more to Dr. Prosser's institution than all the other institutions in this country would charge." If that is not a positive statement of what was being done, I do not know what could be. I shall be delighted to learn that it is not true, and I do not say that it is true, nor do I claim that it is true; but I do claim that that is what Prof. Branch told me in relation to this matter.

Now, Mr. President, I want the Congress to understand and the people of this country to understand that there will be many, many a scheme and many a steal inaugurated in the name of the American soldier.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, why does the Senator put that in the future? It is being done now, it has been done ever since the armistice, and it will continue to be done as long as a single soldier of the American Expeditionary Forces is on this earth.

Mr. SMOOT. I accept the correction, because the Senator from Colorado is correct. Every faddist in the United States, every schemer who can think of some kind of a proposition to get dollars out of the Treasury of the United States, is trying to bolster it up by the statement that it is for the benefit of the American soldier who fought the battles of our country in a foreign land. Nobody lives who would do more than I to take care of the soldier. In my opinion nobody would object to an appropriation for his relief; but I have seen so many schemes started with the evident purpose of helping the man that starts them, based upon a statement that it was for the recognition of the service of the soldiers of our country, that I am getting suspicious of claims coming under that guise or disguise.

I am not going to object to this appropriation; but I want to say, as I said in the beginning, that this appropriation is not going to be sufficient to carry on the work for the coming year. If the work is carried on with no graft attached to it, in the spirit in which Congress acts in making the appropriation, there is not an American citizen that would object to it.

I doubt whether it would be wise now to send this bill back to the House. I doubt whether it would be wisdom to undertake at this time to make an appropriation for the personnel of the bureau, as is done in the case of nearly all of the different departments of the Government, but if there were time to do so it would be the very height of wisdom, and then make certain appropriations for certain purposes, and then, when reports come to Congress, find out just how the money was expended. The trouble is with these lump-sum appropriations. When we find that there are being paid by the Government, at some of these bureaus, salaries as high as \$15,000 out of a lump sum, with no report made to Congress, we ought to stop it.

I say now, Mr. President, as I said before, that we are not going to reduce the number of Government employees in the District of Columbia until the Appropriations Committee refuses to give the money. That is the only way in which it will be done. Why, do you realize that in the Civil Service Commission's report that I picked up just this morning I find that there were added to the employees in the District of Columbia from June 1 to June 28 four thousand five hundred and odd employees, and during that same time there were separated from the service 3,381 employees, or an increase of 1,119 in the number of employees in the District of Columbia from June 1 to June 28 of this year? We all thought that just as soon as the war was over some of these departments, at least, would begin to reduce their forces.

I know it is too late to do anything with the appropriations for the present fiscal year; but I want to say that I shall object to any further appropriation bills passing this body unless there is some authority that will show why the appropriations should be made. Unless there is a reduction in the number of employees in the District, I for one shall insist that the appropriations be cut, irrespective of what the department officials say.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Is any investigation being made by any of the committees for the purpose of ascertaining the character of services rendered by the employees, and the necessity for a reduction, or the reason why a reduction is not being made in the clerical forces of the Government in the District of Columbia?

Mr. SMOOT. None that I know of.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator pardon me while I call attention to a card which I have recently received? I have had perhaps 50 similar letters and cards from employees in the Government service. I received this one on the 10th of the present month from a relative of one of the employees in a Government department. A portion of the card is as follows:

The person referred to worked her first day in the War Department, Nineteenth and B NW., and filed 900—

Then there is a blank space, meaning, I suppose, papers—expecting to do better the next day. Before the close of the first day several of the young men working there in the same department took her aside and told her to lay off working that way, as she would work several of them out of a job. Since then she has only filed 400 per day. You should pension these young men. It would save office rent.

This is one of the letters or cards of the same character, which I think many of the Senators are receiving, showing the incompetent service which is being rendered, and showing that in many of the departments there are people hanging on, doing nothing, and preventing those who have an inclination to do an honest day's work from performing their service. Something ought to be done to rid these departments of the thousands of incompetent, inefficient, and unnecessary employees.

Mr. SMOOT. If our Efficiency Bureau had the power given them to go into all the departments without the consent of the heads of the departments, and then had power to put their recommendations into force, I have not any doubt but that we could get rid of a third of the employees in the District of Columbia. I receive letters every day from the employees of the departments. I received one this morning. I am not going to read it. It is a long one, but, among other things, it said in the letter:

Employees in different divisions all told the same story, that they had nothing to do for days at a time, and that their supervisors came to them and told them to write letters to their friends, or do anything to keep up the appearance of being busy.

I am not going to take the time of the Senate to read the whole letter, but I do claim that we are not going to separate the employees in the District of Columbia from the Government service as long as we appropriate money to pay them.

Mr. President, I have said what I have for the very purpose of bringing this matter to the attention of the board itself; I want to say frankly to the Senator from Iowa that after what has been said, and the statements that have been made, even were they true, I do not believe the board would now continue such actions in the future. I hope and trust that there is nothing in the reports; but I considered it of enough importance to bring to the attention of Congress, so that if there was any truth whatever in the reports the board would see that that condition was corrected and rectified; and that, I have confidence, will be done.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield the floor.

Mr. KENYON. I rose to ask a question, but I can say what I had in mind in just a minute. It is in reply to the question raised by the Senator from Utah.

I am generally in such thorough accord with the Senator from Utah on these propositions of dispensing with the services of unnecessary clerks, and all these matters, that I do not like to disagree with him now. I do not think we disagree on anything except what are the facts. If they are the facts as the Senator states them, I can agree with him.

I want to say about this proposition of rehabilitation professors that the Senator speaks of, and that they have sent out through the country letters to bring all of the professors here or to different places and put them on the pay roll, that the facts of that matter are just these: When they saw the tremendous amount of work they were to have under this larger number of soldiers they did ask then for the months of July and August—that was the limit of the employment—to register at their different offices around the country professors who could be used for this particular work. I will say to the Senator that it was merely a temporary employment. That is all there is to that story of bringing in all the professors and school-teachers in this country for rehabilitation work; and they did not get anybody.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. KENYON. Yes.

Mr. KING. I should like to state to the Senator that I have received communications from a number of professors and executive officers in institutions of learning throughout the United States, who state that they would be very glad to



operate within their own States and discharge any duty that this board may require that they should perform within their States, for nothing. They want to make contribution toward the work of rehabilitating the soldier, and they would be only too glad to aid in every possible way in their own States without charging anything whatever.

Mr. KENYON. I will say to the Senator that especially in New York and New Jersey has that been true. There have been a great many dollar-a-year men helping in this work.

Mr. KING. Oh, if the Senator will pardon me, many of the State universities and State schools will care for some of these soldiers who are to be rehabilitated; and the universities and colleges within the States and other schools within the States will be very glad to aid and will not charge anything for their services. The difficulty has been, or rather the reason why more have not offered their services, that the idea has gone out that Dr. Prosser and those associated with him were building up a great Federal machine here, and they were paying high salaries, and they did not want anybody within the States who would not separate themselves entirely from their State activities and give their undivided time and attention to the Government and come here and be under the direction of Dr. Prosser and his assistants, so that they could be sent throughout the country on a sort of ambulatory mission. I am sure that if they would utilize in the States the services of the educational men within the States they would get a far better service than they will get now and it would not cost the Government as much as the present plan will cost.

Mr. KENYON. They have been doing that. All I want to do further is to place in the RECORD a copy of a letter from Dr. Prosser to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCormick] explaining the Dunwoody Institute matter. I think it will clear up the entire matter; and I think his other statement clears up the professorship matter that we have heard so much about.

I am in agreement with the Senator, however, that there are probably too many employees; and I wish there were some way in all of those departments in which the number of employees could be cut down. I will join the Senator in any kind of a move in that direction.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter may be placed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

JULY 3, 1919.

Hon. MEDILL MCCORMICK,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCCORMICK: Having been honored with a call from your secretary, Mr. Hansen, wanting certain facts, it gives me pleasure to furnish you the following information as to the training of disabled soldiers by the Federal Board for Vocational Education at Dunwoody Institute, Minneapolis, and in Chicago, Ill.

When the war broke, I was director at Dunwoody, coming to Washington on leave of absence to become director of the Federal Board for Vocational Education under the vocational educational law approved February 23, 1917. By the vocational rehabilitation act, approved June 27, 1918, the reeducation and placement in employment of disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines was also given to the board, and I have been responsible, as director, for this new work as well. I expect at an early date to return to Dunwoody.

The Federal board is using more than 500 institutions in this country for the training of disabled men in agriculture, commerce, and the trades and industries, as well as shops, offices, and farms. A list of these institutions as of June 1 is given on pages 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the Vocational Summary for May, 1919, attached hereto.

These institutions are approved before being used by the central office on the recommendation of the superintendent of training and the chief of the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. Information is gathered about the school. A personal inspection is also made by some representative of the board. Practically all the proposals to use a school are made by the district vocational officer for the district in which the school is located, and approved unless there is reason for disapproval by the central office. All the proposals for the use of schools in the Chicago and Minneapolis districts have been made by the district offices.

Eighteen schools and plants are being used by the Minneapolis district, as shown on pages 3 and 5 of the Vocational Summary attached, the disabled men sent them from the States of Minnesota, North and South Dakota, and Montana. The training work for each district is carried on largely in the district office city where the work can be carefully supervised by the agents of the board.

Dunwoody is one of these 18 schools recommended by the district office and approved by this office. It is a private philanthropic institution giving training for about 20 different trades and industries and has an equipment in plants and buildings worth about \$1,000,000 and an endowment of more than \$5,000,000. It admits all disabled Minnesota men to regular classes free of charge and charges only actual cost for special classes. Since it can not, under the terms of the will of the founder, admit nonresidents of the State free of charge, the actual cost of their instruction is paid.

The records of this office show the following facts regarding the number of disabled men in training at Dunwoody on July 1, 1919:

Number of men in regular courses at Dunwoody Institute to date..... 41  
(Of this number, 7 have discontinued the course.)  
Number of men taking electrical courses..... 7  
(These are included in the number given on the second line.)

# LIST BY COURSES.

Baking.....	3
Electrical work related to telephone industry.....	3
Electrical courses.....	4
Machine shop.....	7
Tractors and gas engines.....	3
Tractor repair and operation.....	5
Linotype.....	1
Commercial photography.....	1
Farm mechanics.....	1
Oxyacetylene welding.....	2
Auto mechanics.....	5
Building construction.....	2
Printing.....	1
Building construction and drafting.....	1

Total..... 41  
Number of receiving-station cases..... 69

## SUMMARY OF MEN AT DUNWOODY.

Regular courses.....	41
Receiving-station courses.....	69

Total..... 110

Included in the above are:	
Regular electric courses.....	7
Receiving-station courses in electrical lines.....	18

Total..... 35

The whole matter of the use of this school was frankly discussed with the standing committee of the board at the start, as I anticipated that some person with a grievance, real or imaginary, would raise the question sooner or later. It was necessary for us to use the school, since it is the only industrial and trade school with proper facilities for this task in the four States of the district. We could not punish the disabled man because the director had been connected with it.

I am informed that Mr. Branch, president of an electrical school at Chicago, has charged that, using my official position here to the advantage of Dunwoody, more than 4,000 disabled soldiers have been trained there. Surely this is a mistake, as the total number of men who have been placed in training from the start of the work in 48 States and 500 institutions was approximately 4,200 up to July 1, 1919. As I pointed out above, 110 of these are in training at Dunwoody, of whom 4 have been awarded courses in electricity.

In this connection it may be interesting to show the numbers of disabled men in training in other institutions for the trades and industries:

Ohio Mechanics Institute, Cincinnati.....	131
Tulane, New Orleans.....	110
Franklin, Boston.....	70
Georgia Tech, Atlanta.....	89
Dunwoody, Minneapolis.....	110
Rankin, St. Louis.....	52

It is possible that Mr. Branch has reference to the training done by Dunwoody during the war of enlisted or drafted soldiers preparing for mechanical and technical positions in the Army and Navy. These were not disabled men, but soldiers preparing for service across seas, sent to the institute by the War or Navy Departments for training under the same contract made with at least a hundred other similar institutions in the country. Dunwoody trained upward of 8,000 men for mechanical and technical service in Army or Navy, of whom about half were for each service.

The first arrangements were made with the Navy by me in June, 1917, while I was still at the school. From June until January, 1917, the institute paid from its own funds as a patriotic contribution about \$100,000 for the instruction of sailors and marines barracked for the purpose at Minneapolis, for which it has not and does not expect to receive a cent of reimbursement from the Government. Beginning January 1 all detachments of sailors and marines were trained at Dunwoody at a price less than actual cost.

When the committee on education and special training began its work of training mechanics and technicians for the military service, Dunwoody was one of the schools approved by the War Department committee. Its dealings were entirely with Mr. H. W. Kavel, the acting director of Dunwoody, and contracts were made by him with the committee directly. I might say, in passing, that in carrying out these contracts the school lost not less than \$50,000 in addition, which it regards as a patriotic contribution.

The necessity for the use of schools for this purpose was urged in every possible way by the Federal board on the Secretary of War, and a general plan for it prescribed to him, which was adopted as a basis for the work of the committee on education and special training.

At the outset the plan was for the Federal board to have charge of the inspection and supervision of the training under the committee. At the very outset, however, serious differences of opinion about policies and procedure caused the withdrawal of the Federal board with entire good will from the work of the War Department committee before any soldiers had been sent to an institution for training. At the request of the committee the Federal board detailed some of its agents to inspect about 40 institutions, one of which was Dunwoody, and report their findings to the committee. This represents the total connection of the board and, therefore, of myself with this matter.

Mr. Branch was very active and very much interested in this matter when a conference was held by the board here in Washington with heads of institutions from all over the country to learn whether the plans proposed by the board to the Secretary of War were feasible. Inasmuch as we had nothing to do with the approval of schools and severed our connection with the committee within a month after the plan was launched, I have had no general knowledge, in a busy life, as to which schools were used, nor have I known whether or not Mr. Branch's school was used.

Now as to the facts regarding the use of Chicago and Illinois schools for disabled men. A glance at page 2 of the attached vocational summary will show these schools as recommended for use by Mr. Sylvester, the district officer at Chicago, and approved by this office. The total number of men in training in the city of Chicago on July 1 was 241. Inasmuch as Mr. Branch's school is an electrical school, you will doubtless be interested in knowing that only four disabled men are training there for electricians and for electrical engineering, as follows: Armour Institute, 1; Commercial School of Trades, 1; Lewis Institute, 1; Lane Technology, 1.

Mr. Hamilton, the superintendent of training at this office, who has charge of the approval of schools, is absent from the city. When he

returns I shall ask him to provide for you a statement as to his decision concerning Mr. Branch's school and the reason therefor.

May I not assure you in closing that so far as I know no person connected with this board is in any way prejudiced against either Mr. Branch or his school. Personally my relations with him have always been cordial and friendly. As we can not, however, place students in every institution, we must make a decision as between institutions in the exercise of our duty and responsibility to disabled men. You are at liberty to use this letter in any way you see fit.

Very truly, yours,

—, Director.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from Iowa, in all fairness to Prof. Branch, that it was not he that told me of the letters that were sent broadcast throughout the country asking for professors who could enter this service. That came to me from a man who is here in the District, and, as I am informed, knew of all the letters that were being sent out.

Mr. KENYON. But has the Senator any of those letters? I have asked the Board for Vocational Training to send me some of those letters, so that I might put them in the RECORD. Their statement, made to me not over 10 minutes ago, is that they are merely temporary matters, lasting only for the months of July and August, when they supposed that this work would be at its height.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I have not the letters, as I stated in the beginning, and yesterday morning was the first I had heard of them; and, as I say to the Senator, the information came to me from a party who said that he knew of the letters and called my attention to them.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I am very much gratified that the President vetoed this bill and gave us an opportunity to right what I think was a serious wrong in the bill as it was passed, so far as it treated the question of giving a chance for rehabilitation by vocational training to wounded or injured soldiers. There were severely wounded, according to the records, about 80,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there for just a moment?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. I think it is due Congressman Goop to make this statement:

Congressman Goop and I met Dr. Prosser and two other of his associates in the Marble Room when the former bill was under consideration, and I heard Congressman Goop say to Dr. Prosser that with the amount of money that they had on hand, and the statement that was made by him that they had sufficient to pay the July expenses, he thought that the \$6,000,000 provided in the other bill was sufficient; but if it was not sufficient, he would promise Dr. Prosser that, as far as he was concerned as chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House, he would see that the money was furnished in due time.

I wanted to say that, because I am quite sure that Mr. Goop felt, just as I felt, that the bill was satisfactory to Dr. Prosser in the way that it was originally passed, with that understanding; but afterwards the question of the limitation of salaries came up, and now, as I understand, that is the reason why objection was made to it more than the amount appropriated. I think the Senator from Georgia knows that if the appropriation made was not sufficient it would have been taken care of.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I understood perfectly when the bill was in the Senate that the appropriation which it carried was not sufficient to do the work. The Senate committee, however, had stricken out altogether the limitation placed by the House committee upon the salaries to be paid. At that time I called the attention of the Senate to a letter I had received from the Secretary of Commerce, with a suggested plan for a limitation of salaries substantially higher than those in the House bill; but as the Senate committee had stricken out entirely the provision with reference to the limitation of salaries, and as it provided enough to go on at present, I made no objection to the Senate bill, although I stated at the time that, of course, it did not carry enough money for the work, but it would do until further legislation might be passed. The radical defect was that when we went to conference the House provision limiting salaries was restored, and with that provision nearly one-half of the force of instructors and experts necessarily would have resigned—a force that, in my opinion, was doing splendid work.

Mr. President, as I have just stated, there were, in round numbers, 80,000 soldiers reported severely wounded and total casualties of something like 240,000.

I believe it the duty—and it should be the pleasure—of those of us who did not go to the front, who stayed at home, safe and sound, to tax ourselves enough to make these men who have lost their arms and lost their legs and been otherwise physically injured financially whole so far as we can possibly do so. I believe that in the case of the man who has lost his leg or his arm and who was making \$150 a month or \$200 a

month before we ought to be glad to pay him all his financial loss. I never have been much in favor of service pensions. If the man gets out sound, I think he ought to receive his compensation in connection with his discharge; but whether he volunteered to go to the front, or whether by draft we sent him to the front, he did the fighting for those of us who were here at home. We should find real pleasure to make up to the injured his loss of earning capacity caused by his injury. I feel that these 243,000 men ought to receive from us willingly a sum which will put them where they can live or earn or be compensated by their Government to the extent of their financial loss as a result of their injury.

The railroad company is liable to its employee who is injured in its service to the extent of his injury. I do not say there is a legal liability on the Government, but I say there is a moral liability, and it ought to be a pleasure to follow the policy of making these injured men financially sound.

Mr. President, accepting that as a basis for my discussion of this subject, I come to the question of the effort by the Government, through the expenditure of money, to fit these injured men again to take their place in labor, in occupations—not perhaps the old place, perhaps a new one—but to fit them, so far as college instruction or other instruction can do so, to take a place where they can again make what they made before their injuries were received.

It was with that in view that I had the pleasure of presenting to the Senate at the Sixty-fifth Congress a bill to provide vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled soldiers and sailors discharged from the military and naval forces of the United States. The Senate of the United States, after a three-day debate, on a roll call, had no Senator who failed to support the bill. It was unanimously passed. Why, it was not only right, it was sound economically. It was sound economically because if we spend two or three thousand dollars a man to fit him to return to occupation so that he can earn as much as he did before, it is a much less sum than we would be called on to pay if we kept up his salary permanently. He perhaps was a man making \$1,500 to \$2,000 or from \$1,000 to \$2,000 a year. If he is left without special training, his earning capacity may be practically gone; but if we spend \$3,000 to fit him again to earn \$1,000 to \$2,000 a year it is an economic saving, according to my view of the responsibility of his Government for his loss. What is wrong with that? It is an economic saving to the country because we are fitting a man who otherwise might do nothing to be a producer and a substantial and useful citizen. Over and above that, we bring back into his life the joy of not being dependent upon charity, of not being dependent upon his Government to compensate him year by year for his loss. We bring back into his life the joy and privilege of doing for himself, of being still capable of earning for himself and perhaps for his wife and his children a support.

Mr. President, when I consider the problem of vocational rehabilitation, I can not be patient with suggestions of extreme, narrow economy. I do not believe anywhere that money should be wasted. But the experience of the countries involved in the war, even before we entered the war, demonstrated the fact that men with physical injuries, oftentimes unable to pursue their former occupation, by special training, by special instruction, have been fitted in many, many instances to again earn a competency even larger than that which they earned before. A fairly well-educated farm laborer loses his arm or his leg or is injured otherwise physically so that active physical labor can no longer be performed by him. He goes to the agricultural college, and in a two-year course is taught and becomes capable of doing a higher order of work than he ever did before and producing more than he did before. I mention this as one of many lines in which the physically defective may receive training which will fit him for profitable occupation.

Mr. President, to give such instruction, to give such aid to the injured soldiers is a splendid contribution upon the part of this country, a splendid use of money, lessening our real liability to them and adding greatly to their value as citizens and their opportunities for happy lives.

I think this work will cost a good deal of money. We have now 13,757 injured soldiers who have been approved for training by the central office. We have 5,200 now in training. We have 8,577 approved, who are going forward at once, and in a few days there will be 13,757 in training. One hundred and forty-seven thousand one hundred and nineteen have been reached by the representatives of the Federal board and have been informed of their rights; 98,779 are under supervision, and efforts are being made to classify and assign them. Suppose it costs \$1,400 or \$1,500 a year to give to one of these men his training and to fit him to go back into active occupation, we should not be disturbed about the cost.



The Canadian Government undertook to erect buildings and carry its injured soldiers into schools organized and built expressly for the purpose. A much wiser policy was embodied in our bill. It was the policy to distribute them to existing institutions, retaining them as near to their homes as practicable.

It has been charged that there was some arrangement looking toward the schools to which the soldiers would be distributed agreed upon before the rehabilitation bill was introduced, and the inference has been drawn that this was to aid favored institutions. I will state to the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] what, if it is investigated, will be found to be the truth upon this subject. The question which confronted those of us studying the problem was, Shall we undertake to build schools as Canada did or can we find institutions already in existence prepared to do the work of training the injured soldiers?

A number of men not connected now with the Federal Board for Vocational Education, but educators and physicians, studied the work of a number of schools and colleges to see if the soldiers could be taken care of without establishing or building new institutions, not allotting the soldiers at the time to the schools, not distributing them then to any institutions, but to find out whether there were institutions already in existence that could meet with some added work the responsibility which was to be placed upon them if selected to train the injured soldiers. That is the whole of it, magnified and misrepresented into the statement that it was a scheme to give money to these particular institutions. The plan adopted was a wise one. I went over it with these men before I introduced the bill. I discussed it with teachers and college professors and men who were not connected with the Federal board to determine whether it was safe to provide in the bill that the money was not to be used to erect new institutions. That was the real object, but it is very easy to take a fact and repeat it once or twice and get a false impression about it. I am personally acquainted with the efforts that were made before I introduced the bill to find out whether institutions existed that could meet the demand.

With reference to the soldiers sent to the Dunwoody Institute in Minnesota by the Vocational Board, I do not think any considerable number are there. My memoranda does not show a hundred already placed in Dunwoody. I have a statement here of the manner in which they are paid. If they are from Minnesota and have no special instruction, as I understand it, the Minnesota students go to the school free of tuition; and most of those who are there are from Minnesota. If they have special instruction, that costs not to exceed 50 cents a day. I have a copy of the letter written by Dr. Prosser to the governor of the institute before scholars were assigned to it, stating that he could not consent to more than 50 cents a day being required as a basis, and \$20 a month was the limit. For students coming from other States, where the institute was not obliged to receive them, the Government was to pay tuition of from \$15 to \$20 a month, according to the character of the work and the expense put upon the institution in the matter of tuition.

The grand total is: Residents of Minnesota, 82; outsiders, 32; actually assigned, contracts pending, and contracts not yet received at the central office, July 13, 114 men for the Dunwoody Institute.

This shows how easy it is to misunderstand and misrepresent. It is hard to repeat a thing just as it is told you, even if you try to do so, and with a little feeling on the subject it is easy to magnify, and repetition transforms a situation from what it was into something which it never was.

I wish to say that I will be glad to join the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor in calling for a list of every man employed in this work by the Vocational Board. I am deeply interested in this work. I am deeply interested in it for the good it will do, and then I am deeply interested in it because it is a measure I helped promote, and I wish to see it conducted absolutely clean, and I believe it will be. I wish every dollar that is expended spent solely for the good of the soldiers for whom it is to be used. I will join in this work the able chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, who succeeded me in that position last March. As he always helped me while I was chairman, I am determined to return the service, and help him as chairman in every way within my power.

Mr. KENYON. I thank the Senator. I hope I may be as the Senator was, for the Senator was always right, and I hope I may be as right as the Senator was and merit his aid.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Senator from Iowa and I agree on practically everything that has been done for several years past, and I think we were both right.

Mr. President, I hope this bill will pass as the House has sent it to us. I do not want Senators to be frightened by the

fact that this rehabilitation work will cost money. What I want them to do is to understand that if we rehabilitate these soldiers we will be meeting a liability that we ought otherwise to provide for year by year in appropriations far greater than any figures that the rehabilitation will cost.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President I offer the following notice in regard to the pending bill, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OVERMAN in the chair). The Secretary will read the notice.

The Secretary read as follows:

Notice is hereby given that under Rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I shall to-morrow, July 19, 1919, or on the first legislative day after to-day when the Senate may be in session, move, when the bill (H. R. 7343) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, is before the Senate, to suspend subdivisions 2 and 3 of Rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, prohibiting the adding of new items of appropriation and prohibiting the proposing of general legislation on any general appropriation bill, for the purpose of offering an amendment in the form of a new section to the said H. R. 7343 making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, which said proposed amendment in the nature of a new section is as follows:

To resume and prosecute work on projects and units thereof under the reclamation act, stopped during the war, and to begin and prosecute existing projects and units thereof which are practically ready for prosecution, to be immediately available, and to be expended under the terms and conditions of the reclamation act, except that in the matter of employment a preference shall be given to discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines, \$50,000,000.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the amendment.

The SECRETARY. Amend, by adding after the figures "\$1,730,000," in line 21 of the bill, the following proviso:

Provided, That the status of peace between the former Imperial German Government and the United States of America being declared to exist, no part of said sum shall be used in enforcing the provisions of section 3 of the act of October 6, 1917, known as the trading-with-the-enemy act, as amended.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, it does seem to me that this bill ought to be passed without adding anything to it. The chairman of the committee, of course, is in charge of the bill, and his judgment is better than mine. If we are to begin modifying other features of the bill it will be difficult to stop. This money is needed at once, is it not? Are we not running on it now?

Mr. WARREN. It should have been passed before the 1st day of July. We are running without the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We are running without funds since the 1st of July.

Mr. FALL. It is not my fault.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It is not the Senator's fault, but it might be if we add such an amendment to the bill, however meritorious it may be.

Mr. FALL. I have not injected an amendment into the bill until this moment. I have taken up no time whatsoever in discussing it. I have been somewhat in sympathy with the Senator from Georgia, who has devoted a good deal of time when it was here before and now to discussing it. This is simply a limitation upon an appropriation. That is all it is.

Mr. KENYON. I understood, though I may be in error, it states that peace has been declared between Germany and the United States?

Mr. FALL. No; it is simply a recognition of the status as a reason for the limitation upon the pay of United States marshals.

Mr. KENYON. I am not going to object to it.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll. The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Harding	McCumber	Shields
Chamberlain	Harris	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.
Colt	Harrison	Moses	Smith, Ga.
Culberson	Henderson	Myers	Smith, Md.
Curtis	Johnson, Calif.	Nelson	Smoot
Dial	Johnson, S. Dak.	New	Spencer
Dillingham	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Stanley
Fall	Kellogg	Nugent	Sutherland
Fernald	Kenyon	Overman	Swanson
France	King	Page	Trammell
Frelinghuysen	Kirby	Pittman	Underwood
Gay	Knox	Polindexter	Walsh, Mass.
Gerry	La Follette	Randall	Walsh, Mont.
Hale	Lenroot	Reed	Warren

Mr. KIRBY. I announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPARD], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] on official business.

Mr. DIAL. I announce the absence of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] on account of illness in his family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I am not out of sympathy with the object sought to be accomplished by the Senator from New Mexico, but I think it would be unfortunate to involve this bill, which ought to pass at once, with anything else. So I make the point of order that the amendment is general legislation offered on an appropriation bill; and, if the Chair will permit me, I will state the reason why I insist that it is general legislation.

The trading-with-the-enemy act fixed the time of the proclamation of the President as the time when peace shall be restored. The amendment proposes to substitute, I think, the declaration of Congress as the time of the termination of the war in place of the time fixed in the trading-with-the-enemy act.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia, possibly, is unaware of the fact that the trading-with-the-enemy act is permanent legislation that has been on the statute books of this country in one form or another since 1798, and during the present conditions the Congress of the United States in its wisdom saw fit to enact legislation along that line.

The trading-with-the-enemy act is itself permanent legislation which is invoked or coming in force automatically whenever this country is at war. The original act was placed upon our statute books during the status of war, which was never declared, between France and the United States of America. Section 3 of the trading-with-the-enemy act, which is the section referred to in the proposed amendment, simply makes it unlawful—

(a) For any person in the United States, except with the license of the President, granted to such person, or to the enemy, or ally of enemy, as provided in this act, to trade, or attempt to trade, \* \* \*

That is permanent legislation which in one form or another we keep on our statute books, so that if war arises it is not necessary to reenact the legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Let me ask the Senator, Is there a provision in the amendment limiting it to the termination of the war by the proclamation by the President?

Mr. FALL. There are other provisions of the act, such, for instance, as the provision with reference to the Alien Property Custodian, which, when the President declares the war to have ended, become inoperative.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit an inquiry?

Mr. FALL. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Has this subject received consideration at the hands of the Foreign Relations Committee, of which the Senator is a member? If so, did not the committee act adversely upon the suggestion of the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. FALL. I made a statement in the Senate immediately after the action or nonaction—it was not action—by the Foreign Relations Committee, in which I stated that I had assurances that the resolution would be reported out within a day or two. At that time Germany had not yet signed the peace treaty. My understanding was that some Senators thought that the resolution to which the Senator from Utah refers should not be reported out until after Germany had signed the treaty, for the reason that otherwise I might be accused of giving encouragement to Germany not to sign the peace treaty. I have not brought the resolution up nor attempted to bring it up since.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit another inquiry?

Mr. FALL. Certainly.

Mr. KING. In view of the fact that the matter is still before the committee and has received consideration at its hands, and in view of the further fact that Germany has signed the treaty and the committee will undoubtedly act very promptly one way or the other upon the resolution, does not the Senator from New Mexico think it would be somewhat of a discourtesy for us now to take it out of the hands of the committee?

Mr. FALL. The Senator may possess a very much finer and keener sense of courtesy than has the Senator from New Mexico. If the Senator from New Mexico had entertained any such sentiment he would not have offered this amendment, because the Senator does not intend, however ignorantly he may act, to show any discourtesy to the Foreign Relations Committee, or any other committee, or any individual Senator, or to the Senate as a whole.

Mr. President, the status of affairs is simply this, and it might just as well be understood once for all: The status of peace between the United States and Germany exists, and are you afraid to declare it and turn your citizens loose and let them trade?

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, does the Senator understand that the adoption of a resolution declaring that the United States is at peace with Germany would in any way control the status in Germany as viewed by the German Government?

Mr. FALL. No; I do not.

Mr. PITTMAN. Then we would be in a position where we had declared ourselves at peace with Germany, with no declaration on the part of Germany that she was at peace with the United States; would we not?

Mr. FALL. No; not at all.

Mr. PITTMAN. That was the view I took of it.

Mr. FALL. I do not think the Senator understands the situation. In the first place, Mr. President, there seems to be an idea in the minds of a great many people—and I am not surprised that the opinion should be entertained by the layman, the ordinary citizen, who is busy with his engagements and does not pay any attention to matters of this kind—I am not at all surprised that the opinion exists, because of the propaganda which has been going on in this country for so long, to the effect that it was necessary to force the hand of the Senate of the United States, that they should ratify a peace treaty in order that peace might exist. The fact is that peace exists and has existed, and it becomes the duty of some one in this country to put it in effect, to put it in force; and the signing of a treaty or the ratification of the treaty is not the only method by which peace is brought about.

When war ceases peace exists. War is a status. Peace is a status. Peace is the ordinary status of the people of the earth. War is an extraordinary condition, establishing a status. You do not make war by declaring war. You do not make peace by declaring peace. You make war by fighting. You make peace by ceasing to fight. The rules and regulations under which the peoples of the several Governments will continue to act after the status has been established are embraced in what is known as a treaty of peace, and that is all that we have before us to-day and are considering in the Foreign Relations Committee now.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. FALL. For a question; yes, sir.

Mr. PITTMAN. If peace is a question of fact and not of declaration, why is the Senator desirous of having a declaration on the part of the United States until a joint or contemporaneous declaration is made on the part of Germany?

Mr. FALL. Oh, Mr. President, so far as we are concerned—the Senator is a lawyer—this is municipal legislation, applicable to the people, if it is anything, that we are considering here, a sundry civil bill; and if this amendment is not subject to the point of order, then it is purely legislation affecting the people of the United States, and has nothing to do with Germany or whether Germany declares the war to cease or not.

Mr. President, the blockade has been lifted. The different nations of the world are trading with Germany. The President of the United States, if we can believe the public press, is issuing licenses to citizens of the United States enabling them to trade with Germany. The papers have informed us of this fact, and that those who seek licenses may get them at the proper office. If this amendment has any effect whatsoever, it will simply be to place all citizens on an equality, so that under a prosecution for a violation of section 3 of the trading-with-the-enemy act, such a citizen not holding a license issued by the President of the United States can offer the amendment itself in justification for his act.

That is the status of the amendment. If it is subject to a point of order, let the point be raised and the ruling be had. If it is not, let us have a vote.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I have just read the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico; and it appears to me that the substance of the amendment is an effort by indirection to declare the status existing between this Government and the Government of Germany, without awaiting the usual course of the ratification of a treaty. It appears to me that there can be but one conclusion as to the purpose of the amendment. It reads as follows:

That the status of peace between the former Imperial German Government and the United States of America being declared to exist, no part of said sum shall be used in enforcing the provisions of section 3 of an act of October 6, 1917, known as the trading-with-the-enemy act.

Now, of course, if we do not desire further to enforce the provisions of the trading-with-the-enemy act we have a right to say so, and withhold those portions of the appropriation in this bill that will probably go to the United States marshals and district attorneys; and it might be in order, if it is not new legislation, for the Congress to make that limitation. The only criticism of that, if that were all that were contained in the body of this amendment, would be as to whether or not we desired to continue in force the terms of the trading-with-the-enemy act.

I understand that under Executive orders at the present time the trading-with-the-enemy act is not being enforced. There



may be some technical orders being issued that it is necessary to promulgate in order to comply technically with the terms of the act; but there is no real effort to restrict trade under the terms of the trading-with-the-enemy act at this time.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. FALL. Unless the terms of section 3 are being complied with, then whoever is allowing such trading is violating the law of the United States.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I said that probably some technical blanket orders are being issued to prevent that; but whilst the Senator is on his feet I should like to ask him a question. Would he be willing to consent to strike out of his amendment these words?—

That the status of peace between the former Imperial German Government and the United States of America being declared to exist—

And just let the amendment read as follows:

*Provided, That no part of said sum shall be used in enforcing the provisions of section 3 of an act of October 6, 1917, known as the trading-with-the-enemy act.*

Mr. FALL. Does the Senator ask me that question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. FALL. I have a little Irish in me. Will the Senator tell me whether, in the event I consent to striking out those words, he will support the amendment?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; I will support it.

Mr. FALL. Very well, sir. I have no objection to striking them out.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. All right, Mr. President. With that modification of the amendment, I have nothing further to say. I have no desire to keep the trading-with-the-enemy act on the statute books.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. With that modification of the amendment, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. FALL. Of course, I simply desire to say that I am anxious to get results, and that I have consented to strike out that clause for the purpose of getting results. Any other or further purpose I have had has been achieved by offering it as it was in the original words.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment as modified.

The Secretary read as follows:

*Provided, That no part of said sum shall be used in enforcing the provisions of section 3 of an act of October 6, 1917, known as the trading-with-the-enemy act, as amended.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon the adoption of the amendment as modified.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, in view of the condition of this legislation, I trust that that amendment may not be adopted. While fully in sympathy with the movement, yet I am also in sympathy with these thousands of men and women who are waiting for the compensation due them, and with these establishments that are really going ahead without warrant of law, as they have been doing for more than half of this month. It seems to me necessary that we should at this time pass this bill as it has come to us from the House and take up these other matters at some later day.

Therefore I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I want to say that, of course, the Senator from Wyoming is not at all to blame in this matter; but, nevertheless, I have been misled into the thought that there would be no objection to this proposed amendment if I acceded to the suggestion of the Senator from Alabama. Otherwise I certainly should have endeavored to secure a vote directly upon the question as to whether the Senate of the United States, at least, as one body, is ready to declare its recognition of the fact that peace exists between this country and Germany. Of course now there is no opportunity for me to have the voice of the Senate upon that proposition by virtue of the fact that I have been, not of course caught in a trap, because no one intended to lay any for me—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I want to say to the Senator that I have had no conference with the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. FALL. I am sure of that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. And so far as I am concerned I am perfectly willing to vote for the Senator's amendment, and will do so.

Mr. FALL. I am confident that the Senator will; and I was simply expressing my very serious regret that the chairman of the committee had refrained from expressing himself until after the agreement had been reached between the Senator from

Alabama and the Senator from Georgia and myself, and I had agreed to an amendment of the amendment.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator is reminded that there was a point of order made by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] which was pending and not determined upon and waiting until this later consent to change the amendment.

Mr. FALL. Oh, I am not accusing the Senator—

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I want the Senator from New Mexico to understand that the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Georgia can not bind the Senate, and that we are not obliged to adopt this amendment because they have agreed on it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

Mr. FALL. I have not undertaken to make any such assertion nor any such suggestion. The remark of the Senator is entirely unwarranted. I was simply expressing my personal regret that I had been led into certain action by the suggestion of the Senator. I have criticized no Senator whomsoever, and the Senator from Minnesota should know from our past association that he is the last one in this body whom I would attempt to criticize in any way.

Mr. NELSON. I was surprised, Mr. President, at the language of the Senator. He seemed to intimate that this thing was settled because of the agreement that had been made. I want to say to him that it is not settled for one. There will be one vote against it, anyway.

Mr. FALL. Why, of course; and I want to say that I was very much surprised at the attitude and the language of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota misunderstood me. The Senator from New Mexico withdrew his amendment—that part of it which I thought made it subject to a point of order. Therefore I withdrew my point of order. I still hope that the bill will pass without any amendment at all.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I am sorry that the Senator from Minnesota seems to think that some of his brother Senators have made an agreement that affects him. My purpose in rising a moment ago was to combat the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico as it stood, because I believed that the language in the amendment at that time involved those very grave questions which affected peace conditions in this country; and, believing that they should only be considered in the proper way in connection with the treaty, I was prepared to resist the amendment on that ground. But I wanted to know the attitude of the Senator from New Mexico, and I asked him as to whether or not he was trying to withhold appropriations from the future carrying on of the trading-with-the-enemy act, or whether the main purpose of his amendment was to affect the peace status of the country. When I asked him if he was willing to strike out those words that related to the peace status of the country, he said he was, but first asked me if I was willing to support the amendment without them, and I said I would; that I was willing to support his amendment if it did not affect questions relating to peace.

That conversation was entirely between the Senator from New Mexico and myself. Of course, it did not affect anyone else in the Senate; and I merely wish to say that, so far as I am concerned, the trading-with-the-enemy act was a very useful piece of legislation when we were in an actual condition of war. I expect and hope that within 30 days the treaty of peace will be ratified by the United States Senate and a technical condition of war will be over, as an actual condition of war is over, and therefore I see no reason in the world why any money should be wasted in carrying on the trading-with-the-enemy act at a time when we have let down the bars for the admission of all classes of goods into the enemy country to-day. By the terms of the agreement entered into in Paris, not waiting for our ratification, the doors are open to Germany for the goods and the trade of every nation on the earth, including ourselves.

Now, I do not believe that the executive branch of the Government will use any of this money to further enforce the trading-with-the-enemy act, but if that were done it certainly would be a waste of public money. Therefore I do not see any harm whatever in adopting the proposal of the Senator from New Mexico and providing that this money shall not be used for that purpose when we do not want it used for the purpose, when we are not going to use it for the purpose, after he has stricken out that section of the amendment which related to the peace status of the two nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. FALL. I call for the yeas and nays.  
The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIAL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. NEWBERRY]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] and vote "nay."

Mr. UNDERWOOD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING]. He is absent to-day. I transfer that pair to my colleague, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], and vote "yea."

Mr. WALSH of Montana (when his name was called). I inquire if the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have a pair with that Senator, which I transfer to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], and vote "nay."

Mr. WATSON (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT] to the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] and vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a standing pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. TRAMMELL (after having voted in the negative). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and will let my vote stand.

Mr. FERNALD. I have a pair with the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] and vote "yea."

Mr. FALL (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. HENDERSON (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. MCCORMICK]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] and will let my vote stand.

Mr. KELLOGG. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], who is absent, and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. KIRBY. I wish to announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] are necessarily detained from the Senate.

Mr. GERRY. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] are detained on official business.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER];

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS] with the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD];

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]; and

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH].

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 33, as follows:

#### YEAS—27.

Borah	Gronna	Lenroot	Poindexter
Cummins	Hale	Lodge	Spencer
Curtis	Harding	McCumber	Sutherland
Dillingham	Johnson, Calif.	Moses	Underwood
Fall	Kenyon	New	Wadsworth
Fernald	Knox	Norris	Watson
France	La Follette	Page	

#### NAYS—33.

Ashurst	Henderson	Pittman	Thomas
Beckham	Hitchcock	Ransdell	Trammell
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Shields	Walsh, Mass.
Culberson	King	Smith, Ariz.	Walsh, Mont.
Dial	Kirby	Smith, Ga.	Warren
Gay	McKellar	Smith, Md.	Williams
Gerry	Nelson	Smoot	
Harris	Nugent	Stanley	
Harrison	Overman	Swanson	

#### NOT VOTING—36.

Ball	Frelinghuysen	McNary	Reed
Bankhead	Gore	Martin	Robinson
Brandeggee	Johnson, S. Dak.	Myers	Sheppard
Calder	Jones, Wash.	Newberry	Sherman
Capper	Kellogg	Owen	Simmons
Colt	Kendrick	Penrose	Smith, S. C.
Edge	Keyes	Phelan	Sterling
Elkins	McCormick	Phipps	Townsend
Fletcher	McLean	Pomerene	Wolcott

So Mr. FALL's amendment was rejected.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 44, line 18, insert the following additional proviso:

*Provided further, That the board is authorized to use of any unexpended balance on hand the sum of \$50,000 for assisting in the construction and equipment of a woman's reformatory institution near Camp Pike, in Arkansas, said board having agreed with the local State authorities to furnish said sum for the purposes upon their supplying a like amount, which has been done.*

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, while I might under other circumstances not object to this amendment, as I said a moment ago in reference to another matter, I feel that the necessity of passing the bill without amendments of that kind makes it necessary for me to make a point of order against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken. If there be no further amendment proposed, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I rise to a question of order. I make the point of order that, having given written notice in compliance with the rule that to-morrow I would offer an amendment, the final vote can not be taken to-day. My notice serves automatically to postpone a final vote on the passage of the bill until to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is not well taken.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I desire to be heard for a minute upon the point of order. I had no opportunity to give the notice until to-day. The bill was passed by the House only yesterday afternoon. Prior to that time I did not know but what the bill would be defeated in the House. I had no way of knowing that it would pass the House and come to the Senate, and it was only reported to the Senate to-day. I had no way of knowing what would be in the bill as reported until it was reported to-day. I had no way of knowing what the committee might put in the bill or take out of the bill. I had no way of knowing what the contents of the bill would be until it was reported to-day.

A construction of a rule which would make the rule meaningless and ineffective is not a sound construction of a rule. A rule must be given some construction which will make it operative and effective and which will make it mean something. If you give a rule a construction which destroys the rule, then the construction is unsound, because it would destroy the very subject which you are construing.

If the bill had been up for consideration before the Senate on yesterday, I think it could be justly contended that by giving my notice to-day I was too late, but I had no opportunity to give the notice until to-day. I claim that the rule under which I gave my notice, Rule XL of the Senate, operates so that when a bill is reported to the Senate, if a notice is given of a motion to suspend the rule in order to offer an amendment which is prohibited by the rules, it operates automatically to put the final vote over one day—that is, if it is offered on the day the bill is reported.

If I were to give the notice to-morrow, the bill having been before the Senate to-day, that I would on Monday make this motion, then I would have slept on my rights. But I have had no rights to sleep on heretofore.

I say when the bill is just reported to the Senate this rule places it in the power of any Senator to put the vote over one day if he gives his notice on the same day that the bill is reported, not if he gives notice on a subsequent day, but on the same day he can postpone the vote for 24 hours. You may say if a Senator can do that he can postpone the vote on the bill forever, but that is not sound, because his right to postpone the vote 24 hours is limited to giving a notice on the same day the bill is reported to the Senate, and after that day if he gives a notice he is too late and he has slept on his rights. Unless you take that construction of the rule it simply destroys the right of a Senator to give notice on the same day a bill is reported that he will on the next day move to suspend the rules in order to offer an amendment which is forbidden by the rules. Unless that construction is taken, then a Senator is powerless to give notice that he will move to suspend the rules on the same day the bill is reported if the rest of the Senate is ready to vote that day. Therefore I urge the point of order that the bill can not be voted on to-day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. MYERS. Then, Mr. President, I offer the amendment now without notice, and in doing so I will beg the chairman of the committee in charge of the bill not to make a point of order against it, because a delay of one day will not hurt anything in



regard to the bill. I ask that the amendment may be read, so that the chairman of the committee may hear it. I offer it now without notice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The SECRETARY. Add at the proper place in the bill:

To resume and prosecute work on projects and units thereof under the reclamation act stopped during the war and to begin and prosecute existing projects and units thereof which are practically ready for prosecution, to be immediately available and to be expended under the terms and conditions of the reclamation act, except that in the matter of employment a preference shall be given to discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines, \$50,000,000.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I would like to help my friend the Senator from Montana at the proper time, but I am compelled to make a point of order against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MYERS. Then I will offer another amendment, which is materially different. I ask that it be read and hope it may appeal to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The SECRETARY. Add at the proper place:

To prosecute further work on projects, and units thereof, under the reclamation act, now in course of construction, and to begin and prosecute new projects and units thereof in drought-stricken regions of the United States, to be immediately available and to be expended under the terms and conditions of the reclamation act, except that in the matter of employment a preference shall be given to drought-stricken and suffering homesteaders, farmers, and ranchers, \$5,000,000.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I shall have to make a point of order against that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MYERS. I was in hopes the chairman of the committee would not make a point of order against it, as it is for a much smaller sum. Of course, that is a matter for the Chair to rule upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has sustained the point of order.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I can not believe that the Senator's point of order is well taken.

Mr. WARREN. Pretty nearly all points of order lie against it. In the first place, it has not been estimated for; in the second place, it has not been presented to the committee and printed a day beforehand; it is legislation, and it also increases an appropriation.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I did not understand the Senator to put his objection on those grounds.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is in the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I desire to renew my point of order that the Senate can not vote on the bill to-day, in view of the notice I have given.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] sustained the point of order, and the Chair will stand by the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. MYERS. Then I appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana appeals from the ruling of the Chair. The question is, Shall the ruling of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate? [Putting the question.] The ayes have it.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### ARTICLE 10, COVENANT OF LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I give notice that on Monday, the 28th day of July, at the close of the morning business, I shall address the Senate upon article 10 of the covenant of the league of nations.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I move that when the Senate adjourns it be to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

#### DEPARTMENT EQUIPMENT FOR ROAD PURPOSES.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, on July 1 the Senate adopted two resolutions—Senate resolution 108 and Senate resolution 109—one directing the Secretary of Agriculture to report the quantity and description of war material, equipment, and supplies, particularly the number and description of cars, trucks, and tractors, which will be required for the use and improvement of highways, and so forth. A supplement or complement to that resolution directed the Secretary of War to report to the Senate the number and description of cars, trucks, tractors, and other war material, equipment, and supplies on hand and which are not needed by the War Department, and so forth. The purpose was to

require these departments to indicate the number of cars that would be required for road purposes and the number that would be available then for sale.

My information was that there were several thousand trucks that were not being properly cared for, and that would so deteriorate as to become of little or no value, whereas if they were properly handled and properly disposed of several millions of dollars might result to the Government. I desire to inquire whether, pursuant to these resolutions, these departments have responded and furnished the information required.

The VICE PRESIDENT. None has come to the hands of the Chair.

Mr. KING. I shall simply content myself with saying that some of these departments are very slow in answering the demands and requests made for information by the Senate. If these departments fail to furnish this information at the next meeting of the Senate I shall ask for the passage of appropriate resolutions which I hope will secure the information called for.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I think I ought to say that it will be necessary to keep the Senate in session until the sundry civil bill has been signed by the presiding officers. The bill has gone back to the House, and there will be no delay in signing it, because it is engrossed and ready. In the meantime I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 1 hour and 25 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 7343. An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 73. Joint resolution authorizing the President to extend invitations to other nations to send representatives to the World Cotton Conference to be held at New Orleans, La., October 13 to 16, 1919, inclusive.

#### DEATH OF EDWARD V. MURPHY.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I rise to announce the death of Edward V. Murphy, at Albany, N. Y., on the 16th instant, while en route to Canada, where he hoped he might regain his rapidly failing health. He is to be interred in this city on Monday next.

For almost 60 consecutive years he has been connected with the official stenographic force of the Senate. Mr. Murphy entered upon this work on February 13, 1860, and ever since that time has rendered most faithful and efficient service. His has been a wonderful experience, and his contact with men and measures before and since the Civil War made him a most interesting and instructive figure in and around the Capitol. Always faithful, courteous, and kindly, and holding him, as I did, in the highest regard, I feel constrained to announce the death of this splendid public servant to my colleagues in the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I offer the following resolutions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be read. The resolutions were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with deep sensibility of the death of Edward V. Murphy, late one of its Official Reporters, and expresses its sense of the fidelity, industry, and ability with which he discharged the duties of his responsible office.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary transmit a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I move as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, July 21, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 18, 1919.*

#### CONSULS.

#### CLASS 5.

Edward J. Norton to be a consul of class 5.

#### CLASS 8.

Harry A. McBride to be a consul of class 8.

Raymond C. Mackay to be a consul of class 8.

William W. Early to be a consul of class 8.

William P. Garrety to be a consul of class 8.

## DIRECTOR BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE.

Philip B. Kennedy to be Director Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

## FIRST ASSISTANT DIRECTOR BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE.

Roy S. McElwee to be First Assistant Director Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

## ASSISTANT APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

S. M. Angell to be assistant appraiser of merchandise for customs-collection district No. 20, with headquarters at New Orleans, La.

## UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Albert Bollschweiler to be United States Marshal, District of New Jersey.

## COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

George H. Durgin to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer.

## COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Thomas H. Tulley to be collector of customs for customs-collection district No. 47, with headquarters at Denver, Colo.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, July 18, 1919.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou everliving God, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever; creating, re-creating, upholding, sustaining Thy children in everything that is pure and holy, help us to be too wise to be ignorant, too strong to be weak, too broad to be narrow, too just to be prejudiced, too noble to be mean, too generous to be selfish, too brave to be cowards, that the trend of our life may be Godward in imitation of the world's Great Exemplar. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the report of the committee, headed by ex-Justice of the Supreme Court Charles E. Hughes, on the Bureau of War Risk Insurance in reference to the consultations they have been having the last few days.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the report made by the committee on the War Risk Insurance Bureau.

Mr. WALSH. What committee is that—Interstate Commerce—

Mr. RAYBURN. No; a report made by the committee headed by ex-Justice Hughes, which has been through the bureau in the last few days, an expurgated copy of which was found in the newspapers this morning.

Mr. WALSH. Ex-Justice Hughes?

Mr. RAYBURN. And several other members.

Mr. WALSH. The name sounds familiar.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this committee is an unofficial committee, is it not?

Mr. RAYBURN. Oh, yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And some society ladies and others are on it, are they not?

Mr. RAYBURN. Well, I do not know that that is any reflection on these ladies—

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I do not mean any.

Mr. RAYBURN. They are the heads of great organizations—

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But not expert insurance people; rather a social affair?

Mr. RAYBURN. I think ex-Justice Hughes of the Supreme Court is considered a pretty good authority on insurance matters.

Mr. CRAMTON. Does the gentleman think in a few hours any committee can make an overhauling of that department that would be considered—

Mr. RAYBURN. They do not profess to make any overhauling of the department or a full investigation. This is an advisory committee asked here to consult on certain policies with reference to that bureau.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. What is the purpose of getting it in the RECORD at this time?

Mr. RAYBURN. I would like for the Members of the House to have an opportunity of knowing what they say about certain matters set out in this report.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It makes no constructive suggestions?

Mr. RAYBURN. I think they do.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the request of the gentleman from Texas. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries.

## AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Agriculture I offer a privileged report on the bill (H. R. 7413) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, reports the bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7413) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. DYER. That it is not in order to take it up for consideration at this time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not understand the gentleman is offering it for consideration at this time.

Mr. DYER. I wanted to find out if it is proposed to take it up now.

Mr. HAUGEN. I desire to take it up at the earliest possible moment.

The SPEAKER. The bill is ordered printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 7413, being a bill "making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920." That the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. That there shall be one hour of general debate, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] and one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER]. That at the conclusion of the general debate the bill shall be read. That the provisions in all paragraphs of said bill shall be in order. That on the reading of the bill no amendments shall be in order except germane amendments to the following paragraph, beginning on line 8, page 102, of said bill:

"That section 3 of the act entitled 'An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States,' approved March 19, 1918, is hereby repealed, effective on the last Sunday of October, 1919, after the approval of this act, when by the retarding of one hour the standard time of each zone shall be returned to and thereafter be the mean astronomical time of the degree of longitude governing each zone as defined in section 1 of said act approved March 19, 1918."

That at the conclusion of the reading of said bill it shall be reported to the House with such amendments as may be made to the paragraph specified as subject to amendment. That thereupon the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman a question or two.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri for a question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What makes you shut out any discussion or amendment of these four other senatorial propositions that were hitched on this bill originally and the House never had any chance to discuss except on the conference report?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That was asked by the Committee on Agriculture after consulting with Members of another body, with a view of expediting the passage of the bill. It was thought it would materially expedite the passage of this bill if the Senate amendments, that would have been subject to a point of order, were made in order and reported as agreed upon by the conferees.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What goes of this great hullabaloo here that we have had about senatorial riders on appropriation bills? Have the Republicans entirely surrendered on that proposition or not?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That is not the question immediately before the House at this time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know it is not, and I am trying to get information.



Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The Committee on Agriculture, as I stated, were desirous of expediting the passage of this bill and providing appropriations, so that the salaries of the employees in the Department of Agriculture could be paid. I understand that they are now selling their liberty bonds to pay their living expenses because there is no money available to pay their salaries.

Mr. GARNER. Does the gentleman believe the method he has adopted now will expedite the final consummation of this legislation?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That is the belief of the committee that reported the bill.

Mr. GARNER. I think that its belief is not well founded.

Mr. RUBBY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. RUBBY. I desire to give the gentleman some information, and that is that the report of the Committee on Agriculture was not a unanimous report.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to ask if this is not another instance of "passing the buck"?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I am not familiar with that term. [Laughter.]

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. For a question.

Mr. KNUTSON. May I ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBBY] if the Democratic members of the Committee on Agriculture were in favor of daylight saving?

Mr. RUBBY. I will reply to the gentleman by saying that the Democratic members of the committee, speaking for myself, are not in favor of delaying this great bill by sending it again to the President of the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. For a question.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman knows, of course, that his committee presented and had adopted by this House a special rule for the consideration of this prohibition regulation bill. Does the gentleman think that this bill which he now would make in order should take precedence over the prohibition bill and is of greater importance to the country than that great bill that we absolutely want so badly?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. In answer to the gentleman from Missouri, who is so eager for the early enactment of the law for the enforcement of prohibition, I will state that it is important to the country that provision be made for the payment of the expenses of the Department of Agriculture, which is now without funds.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield further for just a minute?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. For a question only.

Mr. DYER. Well, if the gentleman feels that way about it, that it is so important, why does he intend to make in order a bill which has upon it a rider which he knows from the controversy about it will delay the enacting of this bill into law for maybe months and weeks? [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman be good enough to give me a few minutes?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask for order. I should like the attention of the House for a few moments.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and one gentlemen are present, not a quorum.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anthony	Gould	Kiess	Rhodes
Ashbrook	Graham, Pa.	King	Riordan
Browne	Greene, Mass.	Lee, Ga.	Rouse
Carter	Greene, Vt.	Lanthicum	Rowan
Costello	Hamill	McClintic	Schall
Dent	Hamilton	McGlennon	Scully
Dewalt	Hayden	Maher	Slemp
Doeling	Heflin	Mann	Smith, N. Y.
Eagle	Hersman	Mason	Stephens, Miss.
Echols	Hicks	Neely	Stiness
Fairfield	Hull, Tenn.	Oldfield	Sullivan
Fordney	Ireland	Porter	Tilson
Frear	Kahn	Purnell	Vare
Freeman	Kelley, Mich.	Reber	Walsh
Goodall	Kettner	Reed, W. Va.	Walters

The SPEAKER. On this vote 372 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], to be used as he may determine.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, there are two phases of this matter to which I wish to call the attention of gentlemen of the House. The question of the daylight-saving legislation is not the only question and not the most serious proposition that is involved in this very drastic resolution presented by the Committee on Rules. It was stated before the Committee on Rules by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture when applying for this resolution that there were, as I remember it, at least six legislative propositions contained in the bill as reported by his committee which were placed in the former bill by way of amendment by the Senate and those legislative propositions were never passed on by the House of Representatives save only as the House was voting upon the final completed conference report.

Now, this resolution provides that all those propositions shall be in order, and it further provides that they shall not be subject to amendment. Therefore six important legislative propositions are to be brought de novo before the House for the consideration of the House—propositions that would not be in order, perhaps, under the general rules of the House, and yet the House must pass upon them without even being permitted to offer an amendment to strike them out. I do not favor any such principle of legislation as that, and for that reason I shall vote against the previous question on this resolution.

The other phase of the matter is this so-called daylight-saving proposition. With that gentlemen are quite familiar. The House has passed an independent bill, for which, by the way, I voted, and will vote again, to repeal that daylight-saving law, and that bill is now pending before another body ready for action at any time it chooses to act. That body placed an amendment on the Agricultural appropriation bill which carried the repeal of the daylight saving, placing it there by way of a rider. The President of the United States has seen fit to veto the entire bill because of that proposition. This House has voted once, exercising its right, aye, its constitutional duty, and it failed to pass it over the veto of the President. Now, it is proposed to come again, with precisely the same legislation in principle, and once more carry it to the President of the United States. For what? We know he will veto it again. I can conceive of no reason why it is desired to do it save perhaps to give the House another opportunity to vote to pass it over the President's veto. That can be had by the Senate passing the independent bill and letting us have a straight test on that measure without tying up one of the great departments of the Government. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

As one, therefore, who favored the repeal of that legislation and who will vote again to repeal it, and who will vote to pass that independent measure over the veto of the President, I most earnestly appeal to this House not to trifle with this great appropriation bill and undertake to force this proposition in by way of a rider which has no business on the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN].

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] has referred to six riders. He has called attention to the fact that the six riders have not been given consideration by the House, and for that reason he contends this bill should not pass, carrying them. Yet it has been suggested that the six of the seven riders, not having been considered by the House, shall be made in order, and that the rider to repeal the daylight act, which has been considered by the House and passed upon by the House by a vote of 232 to 122, shall not be made in order.

Gentlemen, will you suggest a rule making in order six riders on an appropriation bill when not one of them has been considered by the House and not the seventh one, which has been considered? Gentlemen, this rule affords an opportunity for the speedy consideration and passage of this appropriation bill. A vote for this rule means the immediate passage of this bill. A vote against the rule means delay. Vote down this rule, if you will. If so, you will be fortunate to have a bill by the 1st of September.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. I can not yield now.

Are you willing that the employees of the Department of Agriculture shall go without pay? We submit the proposition to you. The responsibility is upon you. If you delay, you will be responsible. If you vote down this rule, you delay the passage of the bill.

What is there to this rule? Only that the House may have opportunity to vote for or against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving act. That is all there is to the proposition. Are you afraid to trust yourselves? Are you afraid to go on record? Are you so determined to defeat this proposition—a proposition that 95 per cent of the farmers desire to have repealed, and repealed immediately—to refuse to take care of the department? It will not do, gentlemen, merely to say that you are for the repeal of the daylight-saving act and to do everything that you can to defeat it. That will not go.

It has been suggested that if this proposition is turned down the farmer will forget. Do not be deceived. If the farmer is compelled to get up an hour earlier in the morning, at 3 o'clock instead of 4 o'clock, with his lantern in hand, he will be reminded of the President's veto and the action of Congress. Gentlemen, will you have it said that the Committee on Agriculture, having jurisdiction of matters pertaining to agriculture, should deny the farmers the right to have this matter determined by their own Representatives? Are we not safe in leaving it to the vote of their own Representatives? Are you afraid to trust yourselves? That is the only proposition. Anyone who knows anything about it—and my Democratic friends know it as well as I do, and everybody knows it—knows that the only way to insure a speedy consideration and passage of this bill is simply to give the House an opportunity to vote upon the proposition so that a vote may be had in the Senate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why do you not give the House a crack at these six propositions that the Senate opens up with?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. I have no objection.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for two minutes more.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If you vote for this new rule, you will vote to shut the House up on these six senatorial propositions that are riders. They can not be amended.

Mr. HAUGEN. The House accepted the six propositions unanimously.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. They were accepted by the House on the conference report on the whip and spur of getting this great appropriation bill through, and the House never had a chance to discuss those Senate propositions.

Mr. HAUGEN. I put it up to the Democratic side of this House. Will you now delay the passage of this bill under the pretext that you want consideration of a proposition that you voted unanimously to accept heretofore? [Applause.] It is up to you, gentlemen.

Mr. RUBEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RUBEY. Does the gentleman think he will expedite the passage of this bill by passing it here and sending it to the Senate, and from there to the President to have it vetoed and sent back here again?

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman from Iowa not only thinks so, but the gentleman from Missouri himself knows it. No one knows it better than the gentleman from Missouri. [Applause.]

Mr. RUBEY. I know it will cause more delay—

Mr. HAUGEN. You can not deceive the American people by any procedure of this kind. Be candid about it. We must deal with the situation exactly as we have it. We are trying to pass this bill. You are trying to delay it, and the responsibility rests with you. The responsibility rests upon the President. He kept this bill 10 days. The Committee on Agriculture reported the bill. We have given it consideration, we have reported it, we have requested a rule, and the rule is here. The opportunity is here. Will you turn it down? Gentlemen, the responsibility is with you. [Applause.]

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to say that gentlemen need not be alarmed about this bill being delayed

in its consideration. I say that in answer to the statement of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN]. If the previous question is voted down, a proper resolution for the immediate consideration of this bill will be forthcoming very promptly.

Mr. HAUGEN. What assurance can the gentleman give us for a rule that will give immediate consideration?

Mr. GARRETT. If the previous question is voted down, the gentleman will have his resolution very promptly.

Now I yield three minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I represent an agricultural district, and I introduced a bill to repeal the daylight-saving law. I voted for the separate bill that passed the House and is now in the Senate. I voted for this rider to the Agricultural bill. I voted to override the President's veto. Should the Senate pass the bill now pending in the Senate and the President veto it, I will again vote to override the President's veto. But, gentlemen of the House, I am not going to lend myself to this absolutely inexcusable and indefensible proposition submitted to-day.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] asserts that he has at heart the interests of the Agricultural Department. He knows and I know that every project in that department is embarrassed to-day; that the work is being stopped; that employees who should have been paid on the 15th have not been paid, and are borrowing money all around the city of Washington. He says that we are responsible for the delay in passing the bill if we vote against this rule. Are you honest in it? Bring in a continuing resolution continuing the appropriations that the department had last year. If the gentleman will do that, the appropriations will be continued and this question can be fought out; but to bring this proposition in here when such conditions exist in the department, when employees who are on leave and expected to visit their homes can not go because they have not the money, when they are borrowing money to pay board bills, when the work of the department throughout the country is stopped, and then submit this proposition to the President again, is playing politics instead of in a patriotic way attempting to legislate in behalf of the country. It is merely an effort to embarrass the President. Bring in your continuing resolution and continue the appropriations of last year, and as soon as you do it every one of us will vote to repeal the daylight-saving law. If you do not, you are not going to use us to further any such scheme.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. With the elimination of the daylight-saving proposition could not the Committee on Rules bring in a rule to suspend the rules and pass the Agricultural bill to-day?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman knows that they could and it would be adopted in 30 minutes, the bill sent to the Senate, and made a law within 24 hours. But let us not deceive ourselves. Every man on this side of the House knows that by taking this course we are going to delay the enactment of this Agricultural bill and embarrass the department. We should adopt a continuing resolution to save the department or else leave the amendment out of the bill and send it to the Senate. Let the Senate vote on the House bill now pending in the Senate and send it to the President and if he vetoes it I will vote to override the veto. But this proposition is simply an effort to tie it on here without an opportunity to put an amendment on it, send it to the Senate, and then send it to the President and have it vetoed and come back here and delay the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture. You gentlemen who represent agricultural districts and who are in favor of the existence of the Department of Agriculture can not afford to vote for such a proposition. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield eight minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RODENBERG].

Mr. RODENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of the adoption of this resolution. I concede, of course, that the President was clearly within his constitutional rights when he vetoed the Agricultural appropriation bill because it contained a provision repealing the law known as the daylight-saving law. But I, for one, insist that there are times when even the President is not justified in exercising his right of veto, and especially when by so doing he sets at defiance the overwhelming sentiment of the people whom he is supposed to serve and whose wishes he is supposed to carry out. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The gentleman from South Carolina has talked about the great Department of Agriculture not being able to function. If that department is not able to function it is due to the obstinacy of the President of the United States and nothing else. [Applause on the Republican side.]



There is an explanation for this most unpopular action of the President. In violation of a tradition as old as the Republic, and which has been regarded by all of his predecessors as binding as law, the President, as we know, has absented himself from the country for eight or nine months. He has breathed a foreign atmosphere so long that he is no longer in close touch with the sentiment of the common people of his own country.

The pleas of the farmers—all the farmers—of the mothers of children of school age, and of many of the workmen of this country that they should be relieved of the effects of this irksome and foolish law, passed in the first instance by Congress simply because it bore the Presidential stamp of being a war measure, has fallen on deaf ears.

Of course, now that the whole world has been made safe for democracy, perhaps it is appropriate that the President should insist that every day in this country should be made safe for the joy rider and for the patron of the golf links and tennis courts. Without intending any disrespect, because I have the greatest possible respect for the office of President, I want to say that when the President makes the assertion in his veto message that this legislation is in the interest of the workmen of this country he is about as far wrong as he was when, as a member of the Paris peace conference, he allowed the friendly Republic of China to be robbed of the Province of Shantung by the wily and unscrupulous Jap. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I represent a great industrial district—one of the greatest industrial districts in this country—and the workmen of that district, as well as the farmers, are unanimously in favor of the immediate repeal of this law, and they advance most excellent reasons for their demand. They say that because of the intense heat that prevails throughout the Middle West it is impossible for them to sleep until late at night, when it gets somewhat cooler, but that they are compelled under this law to get up an hour earlier in the morning and thus to lose an hour of refreshing, invigorating, and beneficial sleep. That is what they object to.

Talk about this being in the interest of the workingman! I want to say that the great majority of the workmen who live in the section where we have hot summers are bitterly opposed to this measure.

There is another element that is found in opposition to this freakish law about which I wish to speak, a strong element, strong in numbers and powerful in influence, and that is the mothers of children who are going to school. You and I and every one of us who is so fortunate to have a son knows that it is next to impossible to induce a healthy, vigorous, normal boy to quit his play and come in the house until it is dark. Under this new-fangled law darkness does not come until about 9 o'clock, and 9 o'clock is time for children to be in bed. As a result our boys and girls are deprived of the hour which they have heretofore devoted to study in preparation for their school work of the following day. If you will consult the school-teachers of the country, I venture to say that they will tell you that more children have flunked in their studies since this law went into effect than at any time before in the history of the country. [Applause.]

The truth of the matter is there is not a single justification for the continuation of this law. It has accomplished no substantial or beneficial results of any kind.

Mr. PELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RODENBERG. No; I shall not yield. The law has proved an intolerable nuisance to many of our people, and I hope that when the rule is adopted and the bill is again passed and sent to the President he, for once in his life, will set aside his own pride of opinion and listen to the voices of the representatives of the people and sign the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA].

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, after the attitude that I have taken on this measure and the fight that I tried to put up against this repeal I would be lacking in self-respect and courage if I did not take the floor at this time. I fail to see the analogy between the Shantung situation and justifying the repeal of this law as a rider on an appropriation bill. [Applause.] I want to tell my colleagues on the Republican side of the House—the new Members—that this is not a party matter. We may be new to this House, but we know how a party matter can be brought about, and none of us is bound to this rule as a party proposition.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RODENBERG] complains about the condition of the farmer and the condition of the school children. This repeal does not take effect until March of 1920. It does not repeal the law immediately. We have passed a

bill to repeal that law, and that bill is in the Senate, and we should abide by the action of that bill. Those of us who voted against the bill will abide by it. We threw out this rider on the Agricultural bill when it was before us; we voted against the bill that was passed. The presidential veto was sustained in this House, and now they can not force this on us and say that it is a party matter. The individuals on the committee who brought in this rule seem to individually disavow such action but collectively approve it. I appeal to the new Members on this side that this is not a party matter, but it is simply the pressure being brought to bear by the agrarian movement. We have a perfect right to vote against the previous question and vote against the rule and also to vote against the bill if the rule is carried. There is nothing irregular in that vote. Do not let an argument of party regularity change your attitude. I repeat it is not a party matter. I do not know what percentage of the people all over the country want this measure kept as a law, but I know that an overwhelming majority of the people in my city are for keeping this law as it is, and I believe that when the President returned to his P. C. and got the reports from his listening posts they reported accurately that the majority of the people of this country are in favor of keeping the law exactly as it is on the statute books to-day. [Applause.] In the same breath that we are urged to vote for this repeal comes the claim that we want to expedite the passage of the appropriation bill. Notwithstanding that fact, a rule is brought in, which, if carried, absolutely hinders and retards the passage of the bill. I repeat it, and every man of common sense must acknowledge it, that we have passed a repealing bill; that that bill is now before the Senate; that it can be passed by the Senate in a few minutes and again put up to the President squarely on its merits. If you are so sure that the people of the country want a change, why do you not let it go to the President as a separate bill and not after a veto attach it as a rider to this appropriation bill? [Applause.]

I urge again the Members who have voted against this repeal, who have sustained the fight in the House, to stand by us now and to vote against the previous question and vote against the acceptance of the rule. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, at the request of several Members, I wish to make it perfectly clear that if the previous question be voted down I will then be entitled under the practice of the House to the floor, and will immediately offer a resolution to take up at once the consideration of this Agricultural appropriation bill under the general rules of the House.

Mr. RUBEX. Read the resolution.

Mr. GARRETT. It will take too much of my time, but the bill will be considered under the usual rules of the House, in the manner in which these bills are considered usually. There will, therefore, be no delay about that.

I now yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY].

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to the statement made by the Republican spokesman, my colleague from Illinois [Mr. RODENBERG]. He said that the distinguished President has evidently been out of touch with the people of this country. The Republican Party has been peeved ever since the people of the country reelected the present incumbent of the White House, and because he won the admiration of the people of the United States and went abroad and won the admiration of the world the Republicans are more peeved than ever. I voted against the repeal of the daylight-saving law. It was passed, and this great man in the White House had the courage to veto it because he was in touch with the majority of the people of the United States, and he knows that the majority of the people are opposed to the repeal of the daylight-saving law. It resolves itself into a contest between the farmers and the people of the cities. The Representatives of the agricultural districts come in here, the representatives of the farmers, who are banded together and show their strength. They insist that this law shall be repealed and they demand their commands be obeyed. I come from a city where thousands and hundreds of thousands of the toilers who work in the great industries do not want it repealed, where there are little girls in the factories who are denied an opportunity to enjoy God's sunlight otherwise, and I want them to have an opportunity to get out of doors to build themselves up physically and mentally. There are about 12,000,000 people engaged in agricultural pursuits as against 27,000,000 who are engaged in other industries; therefore my colleague [Mr. RODENBERG] is out of touch with the people instead of the President.

This is not a partisan question, but every opportunity given the Republicans of this House to inject politics and criticize the leader of the American people they grasp it; they admonish him for going to Europe, and if he refrained from crossing the



ocean in all likelihood they would be verbally chastising him for not going. He had a right to go, and no one will deny he reflected the greatness of the United States and acquitted himself in a masterly way.

With you Republicans it is not a question of right or wrong. It is a question of abusing the administration, playing petty politics, and I think the people of this country are getting tired of it.

I am further opposed to this rule because of the riders attached in the Senate, which prevent discussion on the floor of this House of questions which affect all the people of this country; and under this drastic rule we are forbidden to raise our voice against this injustice and abuse. I will vote against it, and ask all of you who are interested in the great majority of the people of these United States, regardless of their political affiliation, to do likewise.

Now, if the gentleman from Illinois and the Republican Party desire to respond to the will of the majority of the people, then permit this present daylight-saving law to run along as it is and thereby give the poor, unfortunate toilers of this great country an opportunity to enjoy a few hours' recreation with their families. Another thing, Mr. Speaker, this Agricultural Committee—

Mr. RAGSDALE. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. It has made it impossible—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG].

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I am very much interested in the discussion of this question. I am interested from two angles. I am interested because the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] gave a good deal of advice to the new Members. I am interested from the gentleman's standpoint who just completed his speech, the gentleman from Chicago [Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY], and I want to say to you men that I have lived in the country a good many years, and I have also lived in the city a good many years, and think I know something of the lives and habits of each class of people. I live in a city to-day, and if there is 30 per cent of the population, or even if there is 10 per cent of the population in the city or in the rural districts of my State—Ohio—that is in favor of this bill not being repealed I will vote with the Democratic side of the House. [Applause.] Under the present arrangement we are placed two hours ahead of where we were two years ago, and everybody in my community and in my State is called upon to disregard the laws of the land and the wishes of the high and mighty, who sends down his desires to this body, to violate the law or be inconvenienced. Every city and every village in my State to-day have disregarded this law and have gone back to the old time. This forces every one of Ohio's citizens to be technical law violators. The only thing that it really causes is inconvenience with the railroads and with transportation. I have it on good authority that the people who are interested in maintaining this law are the financial interests, because they lose a few hours of interest in computing the time at which interest begins and ends. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] I am very glad to hear you enjoy that remark, but if you will go to your banker, and if he does not tell you that what I have said is true I will again vote with you.

Mr. PELL. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. BEGG. I can not, as I have only a couple of minutes in which to speak. Another point. Mr. Speaker, why should not this rule be sustained and passed. It gives gentlemen on that side of the House—the Democratic—an opportunity, if they want to do so, to vote for the bill and for its passage. Many of them profess to be in favor of its repeal. If this action is dilatory, if it is delaying the passage of this Agricultural bill, you can not charge it to a single man in this House, but to the President.

Mr. DONOVAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. There has been one vote taken on the bill, and it passed by a vote of 232 to 122. I can not yield now.

Mr. DONOVAN. All right.

Mr. BEGG. And if 232 Representatives of this House do not have the means to be and are not in closer touch with the common people of this country than any President can be, sitting in the White House, what is a Congress for?

Mr. PELL. God knows.

Mr. BEGG. Nor do I know, by the way it has been acting the last two years, by its bowing to every whim of the President.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman from Illinois just stated he represented the toiling masses, the working people of the land. How do the working people of Ohio stand on this bill?

Mr. BEGG. Ninety per cent or more are in favor of its repeal.

Mr. DONOVAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. For a question.

Mr. DONOVAN. The statement of the gentleman was that financial interests are opposed to it, owing to losing some certain hours of their interest charges. Now, I will ask the gentleman if he will call on the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McFADDEN], one of his colleagues, who is a banker, as to whether there is anything that would cause one to base such an opinion—

Mr. BEGG. I will give the gentleman the privilege of asking the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McFADDEN].

Mr. DONOVAN. I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McFADDEN]—

Mr. BEGG. But not in my time. Mr. Speaker, I want again to call the attention of the House, and particularly the new Members—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BEGG. May I have one minute more?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas controls the time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield the gentleman one minute more.

Mr. BEGG. I want to call the attention of the new Members, because I am one, and I admit we are pretty green in some of our aspects on the floor of this House, and also to direct the attention of the old Members to this fact: We came from the people last fall [applause], and we know their wishes as well as you who are older, and I want again to direct the attention of the Members on the Democratic side to the fact that the reason we are here is because the people back home were not satisfied with your administration. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. I want again to appeal to the Members of this side of the House that you will not get any consideration by pleading with that side of the House. [Applause.] I want to say to the leaders on this side you can count on me for Republican measures, because I am a Republican all the time. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the situation is a very simple one. There are just two questions before us. The first is, Shall we stop talking and begin to vote— [Cries of "Vote!" on the Democratic side.] That is what the previous question means, and gentlemen who vote against the previous question are not voting to settle anything, but simply to indulge in further conversation.

Second, the question is, Shall we consider the Agricultural bill, a great supply bill that should be passed? It is reported by the Committee on Agriculture. The only way it can be considered is under a rule, and the adoption of the rule will provide for the immediate consideration and passage of the bill; and it is the duty of every man on this side, at least, having regard for the great interests served by this bill, to vote for the previous question and vote for the rule, in order that we may pass the Agricultural bill promptly. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kansas kindly agreed to yield to me three minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield three minutes to the gentleman. I will state to the gentleman from Tennessee, however, that there will be two more speeches on this side.

Mr. GARRETT. That is perfectly satisfactory to me.

I have twice stated that if the previous question should be voted down, under the practice of the House some one in opposition to the resolution as it stands would be entitled to the floor for the purpose of offering an amendment. If that should occur, therefore, and I obtain recognition, I shall offer this resolution as a substitute for the committee resolution:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7413, being a bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920; that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with; that there shall be not to exceed one hour of general debate, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAGEN] and one-half by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER]; that at the conclusion of general debate the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule; that at the conclusion of the reading of said bill it shall be reported to the House with amendments, if any, whereupon the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and all amendments to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.



With that resolution there is no reason why this bill should not be considered and passed before the sun goes down to-day.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DAVEY].

Mr. DAVEY. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I appear before you because I am in favor of the repeal of the daylight-saving law.

In the brief time allotted to me I wish to give the several reasons which lead me to that conclusion. First, the people in both the cities and the country in the section from which I come are against the daylight-saving law. The sentiment among the farmers is almost universal against it, and I might answer my very eloquent friend from Illinois [Mr. JOHN W. RAINEX] that the people of the cities, the toiling masses, in our part of the country are against the daylight-saving law. I represent as great an industrial city as there is in the Middle West—the city of Akron. [Applause.] There is no question that the present daylight-saving law is a great injustice to the farmer, and I am very much of the opinion that it is an equal injustice to the people of the cities. I can well understand why those distinguished gentlemen from the East are in favor of the present daylight-saving law, and I can not blame them.

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVEY. I will yield.

Mr. PLATT. Is it not true that Toledo and Cleveland, Ohio, adopted a daylight-saving law ahead of the Government?

Mr. DAVEY. It is true that all the cities of eastern Ohio adopted eastern time, and now they have rejected the faster time and gone back to the old time.

Mr. PLATT. If this bill is passed as the Committee on Agriculture is bringing it in, it will still leave you an hour ahead of where you were before.

Mr. DAVEY. It will leave us where we were by choice.

There is one more thing that I wish to say, gentlemen, perhaps partly in answer to my very good colleague from Ohio—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DAVEY. It is just this, that I appear here as an American citizen and not as a Democrat. [Applause on the Republican side.] I am seeking to serve my country as an American, and I hope to be a better Democrat by being first an American. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the motion will be on the previous question. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] has appealed to the House to vote down the previous question, and at the same time was frank enough to state that that would throw the control of the House to the other side of the aisle. That is the only real political motion that will be made upon this subject to-day—the motion on the previous question. If the gentlemen on this side desire to throw the control of the House of Representatives to-day into the hands of the Democratic Party, they will vote against the previous question.

The next question is on the adoption of the rule. That brings the question of the consideration of this bill before the House to-day, and will enable the House to pass the bill to-day. The motion that would be offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], if he were given control here, would delay the passage of this bill for as long as it takes to pass the Agricultural appropriation bill, which in the last instance was about 10 days. Last of all, if this rule is agreed to, it simply gives the House of Representatives an opportunity to consider all the legislation made in order in this bill. It is not a party question after this rule is agreed to. It is then a question for the House of Representatives to decide.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. For a brief question.

Mr. GARRETT. Of course, the gentleman does not mean to leave the impression that there is opportunity to consider it with amendments?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I did not intend that the House should so understand it. I have stated the contrary. The House will have an opportunity to discuss, however, the only question at issue, which is the daylight saving. That is the only question at issue here; and the motion to recommit will give a ye-and-nay vote to the Members of this House on the daylight saving. If a ye-and-nay vote is not had upon an amendment to that, that provision goes out of the bill. And I say to the House that, if I have any influence with those in control, we shall have a ye-and-nay vote on the daylight saving [applause], so that every Member of the House who is opposed to the law can go on record plainly for its repeal, and those in favor of the law can just as plainly vote against its repeal. [Applause.] All we ask is that the Members of the House of Representatives shall have an opportunity to consider this

bill as indicated in the rule and vote as they please on the question of daylight saving.

The rule makes the legislation in order in the House. Then Members of the House can vote as their convictions dictate and as their constituents desire when it comes to voting upon the question at issue.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas moves the previous question. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GARRETT. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of ordering the previous question will, when their names are called, answer "yea"; those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 201, nays 178, answered "present" 1, not voting 50, as follows:

## YEAS—201.

Ackerman	Evans, Nebr.	Little	Rodenberg
Anderson	Fess	Longworth	Rogers
Andrews, Md.	Focht	Luce	Rose
Andrews, Nebr.	Fordney	Lufkin	Rowe
Anthony	Foster	Luhring	Sanders, Ind.
Bacharach	French	McArthur	Sanders, N. Y.
Baer	Fuller, Ill.	McCulloch	Sanford
Barbour	Fuller, Mass.	McFadden	Sells
Begg	Garland	McKenzie	Shreve
Benham	Glynn	McKinley	Sinclair
Bland, Ind.	Good	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sinnot
Blanton	Goodykoontz	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sisson
Boles	Graham, Ill.	McPherson	Smith, Idaho
Bowers	Green, Iowa	MacCrate	Smith, Ill.
Brooks, Ill.	Greene, Mass.	MacGregor	Smith, Mich.
Brooks, Pa.	Griest	Madden	Snell
Browning	Hadley	Magee	Snyder
Burdick	Hardy, Colo.	Merritt	Steenerson
Burroughs	Haskell	Michener	Strong, Kans.
Butler	Haugen	Miller	Strong, Pa.
Campbell, Kans.	Hawley	Monahan, Wis.	Summers, Wash.
Cannon	Hays	Mondell	Sweet
Chindblom	Hernandez	Moore, Ohio	Taylor, Tenn.
Christopherson	Hersey	Moore, Pa.	Temple
Classon	Hickey	Morgan	Thomas
Cole	Hill	Moran	Thompson, Ohio
Cooper	Hoch	Mott	Timberlake
Copley	Houghton	Mudd	Tincher
Crago	Hulings	Murphy	Towner
Cramton	Hull, Iowa	Nelson, Wis.	Treadway
Crowther	Husted	Newton, Minn.	Vaile
Currie, Mich.	Hutchison	Newton, Mo.	Vestal
Curry, Calif.	James	Nichols, Mich.	Voigt
Dale	Jefferts	Ogden	Ward
Dallinger	Johnson, S. Dak.	Osborne	Watson
Darrow	Johnson, Wash.	Paige	Watson, Pa.
Davey	Jones, Pa.	Parker	Webster
Davis, Minn.	Juul	Peters	Wheeler
Dempsey	Kearns	Platt	White, Kans.
Denison	Kelly, Pa.	Quin	White, Me.
Dickinson, Iowa	Kendall	Radcliffe	Williams
Dowell	Kennedy, Iowa	Ramsey	Wilson, Ill.
Dunbar	Kennedy, R. I.	Ramseyer	Winslow
Dunn	Kinkaid	Randall, Wis.	Wood, Ind.
Dyer	Knutson	Reavis	Woodward
Edmonds	Kraus	Reber	Yates
Elliott	Kreider	Reed, N. Y.	Young, N. Dak.
Ellsworth	Lampert	Rhodes	Zihlman
Elston	Langley	Ricketts	
Emerson	Layton	Rickitts	
Esch	Leibach	Robison, Ky.	

## NAYS—178.

Alexander	Carss	Gandy	Larsen
Almon	Carter	Ganly	Lazaro
Aswell	Casey	Gard	Lea, Calif.
Ayres	Clark, Fla.	Garner	Leshner
Babka	Clark, Mo.	Garrett	Lever
Bankhead	Cleary	Goldfogle	Linthicum
Barkley	Coady	Goodwin, Ark.	Loneragan
Bee	Collier	Hardy, Tex.	McAndrews
Bell	Connally	Harrison	McDuffie
Benson	Crisp	Hastings	McGlennon
Black	Cullen	Hayden	McKeown
Blackmon	Davis, Tenn.	Hefflin	McKiniry
Bland, Mo.	Dent	Hersman	McLane
Bland, Va.	Dickinson, Mo.	Holland	Major
Bocher	Dominick	Howard	Mansfield
Box	Donovan	Huddleston	Mapes
Brand	Doremus	Hudspeth	Martin
Briggs	Doughton	Humphreys	Mays
Brinson	Drane	Igoe	Mead
Brumbaugh	Dupré	Jacoway	Minahan, N. J.
Buchanan	Eagan	Johnson, Ky.	Montague
Burke	Evans, Mont.	Johnson, Miss.	Moore
Byrnes, S. C.	Evans, Nev.	Johnston, N. Y.	Mooney
Byrns, Tenn.	Ferris	Jones, Tex.	Moore, Va.
Caldwell	Fields	Kincheloe	Moore, Ind.
Campbell, Pa.	Fisher	Kitchin	Nelson, Mo.
Candler	Fitzgerald	Klecza	Nicholls, S. C.
Cantrill	Flood	LaGuardia	O'Connell
Caraway	Gallagher	Lanham	O'Connor
Carew	Gallivan	Lankford	Oldfield

Oliver	Robinson, N. C.	Stedman	Watson, Va.
Olney	Romjue	Steele	Weaver
Overstreet	Rubey	Stephens, Miss.	Webb
Padgett	Rucker	Stephens, Ohio	Welling
Park	Sabath	Stevenson	Welty
Parrish	Sanders, La.	Sumners, Tex.	Whaley
Pell	Saunders, Va.	Taylor, Ark.	Wilson, La.
Phelan	Scott	Taylor, Colo.	Wilson, Pa.
Pou	Sears	Thompson, Okla.	Wingo
Ragsdale	Sherwood	Tillman	Wise
Rainey, H. T.	Siegel	Tinkham	Woods, Va.
Rainey, J. W.	Sims	Upshaw	Wright
Raker	Small	Venable	Young, Tex.
Randall, Calif.	Smithwick	Vinson	
Rayburn	Stegall	Watkins	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Nolan

## NOT VOTING—50.

Ashbrook	Gould	King	Schall
Britten	Graham, Pa.	Lee, Ga.	Scully
Browne	Greene, Vt.	McClintic	Slemp
Costello	Griffin	Maher	Smith, N. Y.
Dewalt	Hamill	Mann	Stiness
Dooling	Hamilton	Mason	Sullivan
Eagle	Hicks	Neely	Tilson
Echols	Hull, Tenn.	Porter	Vare
Fairfield	Ireland	Purnell	Volstead
Frear	Kahn	Reed, W. Va.	Walsh
Freeman	Kelley, Mich.	Riordan	Walters
Goodwin, N. C.	Kettner	Rouse	
Goodall	Kiess	Rowan	

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. TILSON with Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. WALTERS with Mr. SCULLY.

Mr. WALSH with Mr. MAHER.

Mr. VARE with Mr. DEWALT.

Mr. REED of West Virginia with Mr. DOOLING.

Mr. STINESS with Mr. RIORDAN.

Mr. PORTER with Mr. HAMILL.

Mr. MANN with Mr. SMITH of New York.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan with Mr. GRIFFIN.

Mr. KAHN with Mr. KETTNER.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. ROWAN.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont with Mr. SULLIVAN.

Mr. SLEMP with Mr. EAGLE.

Mr. MASON with Mr. BABKA.

Mr. HICKS with Mr. HULL of Tennessee.

Mr. IRELAND with Mr. LEE of Georgia.

Mr. KING with Mr. NEELY.

Mr. PURNELL with Mr. MCCLINTIC.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7413) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, with Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas in the chair.

Mr. HAUGEN. I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The first reading of the bill is dispensed with under the rule.

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER].

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I do not intend to take up much time on this bill. I think it is important that this House pass the bill, but I do want to talk just a little bit about the so-called Senate amendments. They are Senate amendments in a way, and in a way they are not. Every one of them was changed in conference. As I understand it, there were six amendments proposed by the Senate, which the conferees finally accepted as revised by the conferees, and they were attached to this bill as it passed. Every one of them ought to be on the Agricultural bill, and it is hardly fair to the body at the other end of the Capitol to criticize them for wanting to put some amendments on the Agricultural bill. Being an appropriation bill, it has to originate in this House; and certainly, as it has to pass the Senate, they have a right to some consideration in it. The conferees of the House reduced the amendments of the Senate until they are merely nominal as compared with other appropriations. Under this rule, of course, the only vote that will be of any consequence is that on the daylight saving. Your committee in reporting the bill as they did were actuated by two things. One

was the current report that the President, having spent a few days in the United States, has been informed concerning the wishes of the people of the United States with reference to this war measure and that he is now ready to act accordingly. I do not know how reliable that information is. Much of my information is of a negative character, procured by consulting the ranking members of our committee on the other side, men whom you would have supposed the President would have consulted before vetoing this bill; men of the opposite party to myself, who are familiar with conditions in the United States, who favor the repeal of the daylight-saving law, and men who know the feeling of the people here. I am informed that the President never talked to one of them before vetoing the bill. He must have been busy in preparing that long treaty and in the work that he had abroad, and he was simply ill-advised in making that veto, and we are all hoping it will not occur again.

The other proposition is that a two-thirds majority of both Houses of Congress have voted to repeal this law, and there was some question in the committee whether that proposition had been properly presented to the Chief Executive. I think he was not advised on this subject. I am sure that some one from that side of the House had talked to him on one of the days that he was at home concerning a man at Ellis Island whom they were going to have removed. Then I think another man spent a day or two with him, no doubt, concerning this man Densmore, and I am satisfied some man on that side of the House has been explaining to him about the Postmaster General, and a lot of Senators were talking to him about the league of nations, so that he did not have time to find out that nearly three-fourths of the Representatives in Congress, representing their people at home, whose sentiments they speak, were asking for the repeal of the daylight-saving law. We are now simply offering him a chance to correct his error. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I represent an agricultural district. I have no large cities in my district. My people are favorable to the old system of time. They are against the new innovation. I voted against it. I voted to override the President's veto. While I did that and while I shall continue to represent the views of my people, as I understand them, I recognize the fact that I am confronted with a situation where I have got to use my judgment as a man and as a lawmaker.

The President was within his authority under the Constitution when he vetoed the Agricultural appropriation bill. We were within our authority when we sought to override that veto and restore the old time. Now, we have before us the proposition as to whether or not we are to have legislation writing the appropriation bill into law, so that the great Agricultural Department may function, or whether we shall pass the buck back to the President and let him again veto this bill, because it carries with it the measure that he vetoed only quite recently. It is a serious proposition that confronts me as a representative of my people; but while that is true, I have come to the conclusion after deliberate thought that we can have legislation on this time question by reason of the fact that in the other end of the Capitol now is a bill containing the very provision that is in this bill. All that the Senate has to do is to pass on that legislation, and we shall have it stripped of the appropriation features of this bill, and then we can vote our sentiments and override the veto of the President, should he veto that measure if it is passed by the Senate. I do not feel that I can by my vote delay the appropriation bill which supports the entire Agricultural Department of this Nation, because that department now needs the funds, and I shall vote to pass this bill without the daylight section and take my chances as to representing my people who are in favor of repealing the daylight law, and when that measure passes the Senate and comes back, even if the President vetoes it, I shall vote to override that veto. That is the common sense of the situation as I see it. [Applause.]

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. LEVER. How much time did the gentleman yield back? The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas had one-half minute remaining.

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. McLAUGHLIN].

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the committee, in reporting this bill in its present form, acted wisely. As has been stated by my colleagues, there are other riders on the bill, four or five of them. It would, therefore, have been unfair to make all other riders in order and at the same time not give the House the privilege of taking



a vote on the daylight-saving proposition—a question on which we have received more petitions for its repeal than have been received on all other matters of legislation put together. More than 2,200 telegrams came to the House Office Building the first day after the President's veto, urging Congress to repeal the daylight-saving law notwithstanding the veto. It is a fact that farm organizations all over the country from New York to California and from the Canadian line to the Gulf are now sending letters, telegrams, and petitions to the President endeavoring to inform him that the farmers of this country are practically unanimous for the repeal of this provision.

Mr. SEARS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska. I will.

Mr. SEARS. If that is true, why does not the Republican majority in the Senate pass the bill which the House has already passed?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska. That is not for our consideration over here.

There were two arguments which the Executive used in justifying his veto of this bill. The first was that his advisers, including the experts of Europe, had informed him that the daylight law was a good and wise measure; and the second that the law enabled laborers to work during daylight and save artificial light, thereby saving fuel.

I submitted to the Members when this matter was up for consideration before that during the months of April, May, September, and October people who start at work at 7 o'clock in the morning, as most people do, must begin work by artificial light. In addition, they must use artificial light in the home to get ready to go to work. So the reasons given for the veto are not valid. I believe that if these things are pointed out to the President in addition to the vast number of telegrams and petitions that will come to him in the meantime, the President will see the wisdom of approving this measure if it goes to him a second time.

I want to submit, in all fairness, that if the people of the large cities see advantages in this measure they can have such advantages without the law—without forcing upon the farmers of all the country the disadvantage of working contrary to the natural hours regulated by the sun. It is unfair to ask the farmers of the entire Nation, upon whom not only this country but the world is depending for food, to work an hour and a half ahead of the sun.

It was argued when the hearings were had, when this act was passed in the previous Congress, that certain manufacturers in the East had adopted this provision before the law went into effect and had found it advantageous. If that is so, why, in the name of common sense, can not they start an hour earlier in the morning and have an hour extra in the afternoon without saying by mandate of law to all these 10,000,000 farmers, "You must adopt this law in order to accommodate us in the city"?

The fact of the matter is a large majority of the laborers in every part of the country are also asking for this repeal. Organized labor recently voted by a large majority for its repeal. The propaganda for the law is being directed entirely by the Daylight Savings Corporation of New York City.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that such imposition is not fair. I appeal to the sense of justice of my colleagues. I believe if this matter was submitted to the President of the United States by his numerous friends on the Democratic side of the House in just the right light he would see the error of attempting to fasten on the millions of farmers and laboring men of the country a rule that is to their disadvantage, when all the advantages claimed for the measure can be had by every city that wants them without any law at all. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I have never known the people of Illinois to be so wrought up over a proposition as they seem to be over this.

On Monday, the 14th, I voted to override the President's veto and pass the repeal bill. Through an inadvertence, which nobody intended, a couple of dispatches were sent from here to the papers stating I was the only Illinois Member of Congress outside of the city of Chicago who had voted to sustain the President's veto. From that time to this life has been a burden. To show the intensity of the feeling, I want to take the liberty within my few minutes to read a portion of a letter I have received.

Hon. RICHARD YATES,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN YATES: I have just noticed that you voted to sustain President Wilson on the nonsensical daylight-saving law. I am surprised to see you vote thus, but you know what you want to do.

You will not have many supporters in this section when you ask for votes again. I have supported you a great many times and under trying circumstances, but I can not and will not support you any more.

I venture to say that every Member of this House has heard from his constituents in every nook and corner of the country on this subject. I have, Mr. Chairman, and I do not want any mistake whatever as to how I am going to vote. I am going to vote here to-day to pass the repeal of the daylight-saving law over the President's veto. And in doing so I will register the will, the overwhelming will, of the overwhelming majority of the people of Illinois. [Applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that Members be given five legislative days to extend their remarks in the Record.

Mr. LEVER. On the bill, on the daylight-saving proposition?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. What is the request?

Mr. HAUGEN. For five legislative days for Members to extend their remarks. Only one hour has been given for debate, and it is fair to give Members the right to extend their remarks.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman to make this specific—that these are to pertain only to the subject of the daylight-saving law.

Mr. HAUGEN. Very well.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. AYRES. I object.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY], a member of the committee.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, we have now under consideration the Agricultural appropriation bill, which covers something like 100 pages. However, in the present situation no attention is being paid to the important provisions of the measure and the necessity of speedy action on our part. With many Members the only question is the sending of this bill back to the President of the United States a second time, when it is sure again to be vetoed and result in still further delay and consequent hardship upon every employee of this great department of the Government.

Let me briefly recount the history of this legislation. Very soon after the convening of Congress in extra session we passed the Agricultural appropriation bill and sent it to the Senate. When we took the bill up for consideration in the House the Committee on Rules was appealed to and asked to give us a rule in order to make the repeal of the daylight-saving law in order upon the appropriation bill. The Committee on Agriculture was unanimous, with one exception, in asking for that rule. Now, what happened? The Committee on Rules refused the rule, and we had to pass the appropriation bill through the House without the daylight-saving repealing clause in it. The bill went to the Senate. There they inserted the repealing clause; it came back here, and we agreed to it. It then went to the President, and he vetoed it.

I yield to no man in my admiration of the President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson, and yet I feel that he made a mistake when he vetoed that provision of the Agricultural bill. In doing so, however, he acted wholly within his rights. When the bill came back with the veto message to the House, I voted to pass it over the President's veto, but we lacked a few votes of the necessary two-thirds and failed to pass it over his veto. The bill was then sent to the Committee on Agriculture. That committee now brings it here again to-day, with the recommendation concurred in by a majority that the bill again be passed and sent to the President with this repealing clause in it. There is not a gentleman in this House who is a thinking man but knows that when it reaches the President of the United States it will again be vetoed.

It is no light matter to veto a bill. No President of the United States is going to put his veto upon a measure without giving it his careful and candid consideration. We know that the President before he vetoed this bill did give the matter careful consideration, and you know and I know when it goes back to him it will mean another veto message and another delay in the passage of this measure. It is not necessary to do that. Three times this House has placed itself upon record in favor of the repeal of the daylight-saving law. You did it when you agreed to the conference report upon the Agricultural appropriation bill, you did it when you passed the Esch bill through this House as a separate measure, and you did it a few days ago when you voted by almost a two-thirds majority to pass this bill over the President's veto.

To-day in the other end of the Capitol there is the Esch bill, which was passed through this body by a vote of 244 to 133. That bill has been lying over there unacted upon for days and weeks. Why do not you gentlemen who are so anxious to put this up to the President a second time go over there and urge



your friends upon the committee on that side to report out that bill? If you will do that, in 15 minutes it can be passed through that body and be sent to the President of the United States. I am in favor of the repeal of the daylight-saving law. I have voted for its repeal, I have voted to pass it over the President's veto, and should the Esch repeal bill be vetoed I will vote to pass that bill over the veto. I am unwilling to longer delay and hinder the passage of a great supply bill when this repeal can be accomplished in the regular way by the Senate passing the measure which has already been acted upon by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield one and one-half minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM].

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote against the repeal of the daylight-saving law, and in doing so I voice the sentiments of more than 218,000 people whom I represent in the city of Baltimore. They have tried this law for a year. They find it beneficial. The school-teachers are in favor of it. I find there is a universal sentiment in the city of Baltimore against its repeal. I wish the bill which has been sent to the Senate could be considered by that body, so that the matter would be taken up in the proper way. I was talking to one of the men employed in the Agricultural Department yesterday. He told me that men there were borrowing money that they might live upon, and that they were unable, many of them, to go home on their vacations because they did not have money, and when they borrow this money he said they have to pay 10 per cent interest upon it. This matter ought to be taken up as an individual matter and not placed as a rider on the Agricultural appropriation bill. One of the speakers has just told us that there are 12,000,000 people engaged in the agricultural pursuits of the country and 27,000,000 people engaged in the industrial pursuits. Is not this great number of people, more than doubling the 12,000,000, entitled to some consideration in this matter?

Take the lives of those engaged in agricultural pursuits. They live in the fresh air and sunshine of the country, amid the trees and flowers and those things which make for health and comfort. Their life is one in the open fresh air and the beautiful sunshine—two ingredients which physicians tell us are more health-giving than all the medicines we could take. Their food is fresh from garden and field, and everything which Providence has provided is at their hand.

The 27,000,000 engaged in industrial pursuits are composed of men, women, and children crowded into the factories and shops of the great cities of the land, toiling behind the machines, sewing in the factories, and performing all the vast services required of them in their line of endeavor. Their life during working hours must necessarily be confined indoors in the crowded portions of our cities, where the heat of the day is reflected by brick and mortar, amid the close air of the factory, and the smoke coming from the great chimneys in their sections. Their only chance to get the fresh air, to enjoy free exercise and a bit of the country, is during their leisure hours when daylight makes it possible.

If you cut off the hour provided under the daylight-saving law in the afternoons they are deprived of just that much daylight in which to enjoy some of the blessings which the agricultural community enjoys all the time. To speak of the golf or tennis player is to speak of only an infinitesimal part of our city people. The men and the women enjoying this pursuit usually control their own time in which to take their exercise or to work; they are not confined to the long hours and the arduous work of those engaged in the industrial pursuits.

I speak for the laboring men, the women, and the children who find, by virtue of this law, they can get into the great parks and recreation centers of our cities to enjoy a little pleasure during daylight when their work has ended, the toiling masses of our people who are entitled to our attention. To go through my city after working hours one beholds in that section where live those engaged in these pursuits thousands of men, women, and children sitting upon the doorsteps, parading in the parks, playing baseball or some other game in which they are interested. It has meant much to these people, and to deprive them of it would be a great handicap.

I realize from what has been said that the farmer is somewhat inconvenienced by virtue of this law, but from my personal observation of the farmers of my State I can not see where it has been very harmful to them. Let them practice a little Christianity; let them remember their brethren engaged in the cities who are the purchasers and consumers of the products which they produce.

My city is largely engaged in canning enterprises, in the manufacture of many articles of clothing, ready-made and other-

wise. When these factories or canning houses close in the evening one beholds thousands of the young boys and girls wending their way toward home. They have time under the present law for something to eat, and then they can make their way to the great parks, the river sides, and other places of amusement for recreation and fresh air.

I do hope nothing will be done to deprive them of this great blessing. If you must test the strength of Congress against the constitutional right of veto by the President, do not do it at the expense of the Agricultural bill as a rider. Let us not subject the employees of the Agricultural Department to delays and expense by not being able to pay them their money. There are thousands of these employees, many of them compelled to borrow money to live upon, some paying large percentage. Pass the Agricultural bill as an Agricultural bill, and let the Senate take up and consider and pass, if they will, the law which passed this House, repealing daylight saving, so that the question can go before the President purely upon its merits, and then if it is vetoed and the opposition wants to take the matter before the country in the next election, they will have a clear-cut case to present to the people.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that this daylight-repeal rider will not pass this House; that the President having expressed his opinion through his constitutional authority and having been sustained by a vote of this House, it will not be put up to him again in a similar bill in a similar manner, but individually as a separate and distinct proposition as provided in the bill I have mentioned.

By unanimous consent, Mr. LINTHICUM was granted the right to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS].

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I am unalterably opposed to the daylight-saving law. My State was placed in a new zone, and therefore they ran the clock up two hours, and we are now practically sleeping in the daytime and working at night. My people are opposed to this law, but I do not believe in hypnotizing myself into believing we can secure the repeal of that law by a rider on this bill any more than I believed in hypnotizing myself into trying to believe that we were saving daylight. I shall therefore not vote for the proposition in connection with this bill. This great appropriation bill was held up until last Monday because of the President's veto, but since that time the delay has been caused by the committee. I voted to override the President's veto. I voted for the amendment to the Agricultural bill repealing the law. I voted for the bill repealing the daylight-saving law, which is now in the Senate of the United States, and I say to my friends on the Republican side, if they have hypnotized themselves to the extent of believing they are fooling the people of this country, I fear they will wake up to find out that they are mistaken. Gentlemen on the other side know they have a majority in the Senate. The people know you have a majority in the Senate, and they know that even before this bill was reported that the Senate of the United States, with or without the Democratic votes, could have repealed that law, and the bill dealing solely with daylight saving could have been sent to the President for his consideration.

Mr. KNUITSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEARS. No; I can not yield, as I only have a few minutes. That would not have delayed this Agricultural appropriation bill, which should have already been passed so the Department of Agriculture and the work under it may be carried on throughout this country without further interruption. I believe the time has come when gentlemen in this House should try at least to rise above politics and meet the measurement of statesmen.

It is all right for you to play your little politics when you go home and try to fool the people, but the farmers of the country for whom you are so solicitous are reading the newspapers, and they know that the play you are pulling off here to-day is merely for political effect, mere buncombe, and it will not get you anywhere. What the people want is a repeal of the daylight-saving law, and I trust my good friends on the Republican side will be sincere, and that they will go to their colleagues at the other end of the Capitol and have them pass favorably upon the bill which we sent over to them.

As I said before, every chance I get to repeal the law I shall do so, except in this case, where I believe I would do more harm than good by voting to again place it as a rider upon this bill, knowing and believing as I do that the bill would again be vetoed and that it would be impossible to override the veto of the President of the United States, as shown by the vote the other day. Let us cease these political alignments and at least for a day legislate wisely.



Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEARS. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Does the gentleman think the President would veto this bill if it goes to him a second time?

Mr. SEARS. If the President was sincere in his first veto, and I believe he was, though I did not and do not agree with him, he will be false to himself if he does not veto it again if it includes the daylight-saving clause.

I desire simply to say further, Mr. Chairman, if the daylight-saving clause is permitted to remain in the bill, and it can only be permitted to remain in the bill for the purpose of embarrassing the President, those who are responsible can not escape the responsibility for any delay in the final passage of the bill.

I desire further to say I trust my Republican colleagues are sincere in their efforts to secure a repeal of the daylight-saving law, and, if they are, that they will see to it that the Senate passes the bill for that purpose which we passed and sent over there some time ago. I shall watch with a great deal of interest the final outcome and the fate of that bill.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, the President vetoed the Agricultural appropriation bill because that bill carried a provision to repeal the daylight-saving law. A large majority, but less than two-thirds, of this House has voted to override that veto. The appropriation bill is again before Congress for consideration, and I am in favor of again writing into it the clause for repeal of the daylight-saving law. The short time allotted to me will not permit a lengthy analysis of the reasons why this obnoxious law should be repealed. Suffice it to say that an overwhelming majority of the people of my district and of the Nation at large demand its repeal. The parents of school children in town and country are against this law; the dairy-men who are now selling their herds rather than stay up all night to prosecute their business are against it; the farmers with one accord are tired of it; 90 per cent of the population in whatever vocation are insisting that this law be stricken from our statutes. That sentiment is reflected here to-day from Democrats as well as Republicans.

You gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber concur with us in saying the daylight law is a bad one and ought to be repealed; yet you say our effort to repeal it in this particular bill is partisan politics. I deny the insinuation of any partisanship in this question. You admit that the law should be repealed, yet you say its repeal should be an independent measure. You say if we pass the present bill with provision for repealing the daylight-saving law the President again will veto it. But I say he is much less likely to again veto the Agricultural appropriation bill with its daylight-saving repeal than he would be to veto an independent daylight-saving repeal bill. We were unable to pass the old bill over his veto; so why should we hope for strength to pass an independent daylight-saving repeal over his veto?

Gentlemen, I put the proposition up to you as a matter of expediency. Let us stand for repeal in the Agricultural bill and put it squarely up to the President. Too much is at stake under these vast appropriations for him to hazard a second veto. One of the greatest divisions of our Government, a department far-reaching in its activities, is now paralyzed by reason of the recent veto. Can the President afford to prolong that disaster by another veto? I say he can not. I assert that at the time he wrote his veto message he was ill-advised as to true conditions. He stated in the message that the daylight-saving law had given "all but universal satisfaction." You Democrats who oppose us to-day concede that the President was misinformed when he wrote the text of that message. But still you say he would veto it again. In your zeal to protect the President from his manifest blunder, perhaps you are unfair to him in your estimate of his character. I have great respect for the office of President; and I have great respect for Mr. Wilson. I want to deal more fairly with him than do you gentlemen on the other side of the aisle.

Some excuse may be offered for the mistake he has made. For many months he has been away from America. Although most of us believed he should have been in Washington, where his official duties lay, he saw fit to spend his time abroad. I do not recall that fact for criticism, because he was following the line of duty as he saw it. But I do recall the fact in order that you may see how completely he was out of touch with the masses of people at home. He could not know how obnoxious and offensive the daylight-saving law had become. In the brief interval between his return from the royal courts of Europe and the assertion of his veto power he had no chance to inform himself about the views of our people on this important question. Moreover, in the abundance of his wisdom, the President is not prone to seek advice from smaller minds. I dare say no Democrat in this

House had the chance to advise him with regard to public sentiment on this matter, and I am quite sure no Republican could do it. Therefore, it is not surprising that the President guessed wrong when he went in the face of public opinion in his veto statement ascribing universal popularity to the irksome, unwieldy daylight-saving law. But now he knows better. The newspapers have informed him. Democratic and Republican speeches printed in the Record from a Congress sent here by a wide-awake national constituency have informed him. Petitions numbered by multiplied thousands have informed him.

No Member on either side of this House will challenge my statement when I say that President Wilson knows to-day what the people of America think about the daylight-saving law.

Yet Democrats stand here and say he will again veto this bill if we seek to repeal the daylight-saving law. But I am unwilling to subscribe to that harsh view of the President. I should not like to believe, as the members of his party assume to believe, that the President would bow his neck in the stubborn pride of opinion and ride roughshod over the action of a Congress voicing the recognized public sentiment. Yet, if my charitable excuse for his veto blunder is not well founded, if he should persist in defying public judgment, then we have the right to know it.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask permission to extend the few remarks I made a while ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, I voted against the repeal of the daylight-saving law and see no reason at all to change my position. The daylight-saving law has been a piece of beneficent legislation to millions of American people. I voice the judgment of over 200,000 people of my district, a district made up of the working class, and I express the judgment of hundreds of thousands of the men and women in my city of every occupation and vocation when I say the daylight saving has contributed immeasurably to their comfort, their pleasure, and their happiness.

The increased hours of daylight made it possible for the people of my city—and I take it that it is so with the people of every other city and of the larger towns—to obtain a greater amount of outdoor enjoyment, a larger degree of convenience to have and enjoy the companionship of family and friends, and a broader opportunity for recreation than they had under the former time schedules. This has been conducive to better health, and it has made for the comfort and improvement of both mind and body. It has been the means of saving fuel and artificial light to a very large extent; and in these days of high and excessive cost of living it has aided in the savings of the middle and the poorer classes.

An amusing feature of the debates upon the law has been to hear Representatives of the farming districts vigorously appeal to the House as though the agricultural interests were exclusively to be considered and people engaged in industrial, commercial, manufacturing, and professional opportunities were deserving of no consideration at all. It was repeated again and again on the floor that those who opposed the provision to repeal were merely golf players and sought increased daylight for their own enjoyment. Those who thus spoke were either insincere in their unfounded and unjustified statements or else woefully ignorant of conditions of the masses outside of their rural environments.

In my insistence that the daylight-saving law be retained, I not only satisfy my own belief in the beneficial character of the law, but I am obedient to the demand of millions of toiling men and women, boys and girls, whom the increased hours of daylight, with all its opportunities and advantages, has brought much cheer and pleasure, better health and economic conditions.

The President in his wisdom, and in the exercise of his constitutional right, vetoed the Agricultural bill because of the rider that provided for the repeal of daylight saving. In his veto message he clearly stated his objections to the repeal. In the exercise of the duty and prerogatives of the House we took a vote on the question whether the bill should pass notwithstanding the President's objection, and the veto for want of a two-thirds vote was sustained. Why, then, try to foist this measure upon this House again? The attempt to coerce the President will not succeed, for were this repeal measure to be again passed by the House it would be met by another veto of the President. I have no patience with this effort to inject



partisan politics or play the game of petty politics with so great a measure as is before us. The attempt now made to pass the repealing clause after the President's veto has been sustained is unfair to the President, and is making a mere football of this legislation. If it should pass, it will lead to an unjustified delay in making necessary appropriations for the payment of Government employees and meeting the expenses for conducting the Agricultural Department and its activities. For such delay those who now seek the repealing clause passed will be responsible.

I am not unmindful that much inconvenience may be caused to a great many people in the land due to the changed daylight schedule, but the greatest good is to be given to the greatest number, and viewing daylight saving as wholesome and salutary to the greatest number of the people, I oppose the repeal of the law.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER].

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOONEY] be recognized for one minute of the five allotted to me.

Mr. MOONEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, there is a very unusual situation in my city in regard to the matter under consideration. Cleveland, I think, was the first, certainly one of the first, cities to adopt the daylight-saving plan and it gave universal satisfaction, but shortly after the Nation followed our lead we were transferred from the central to eastern time zone. Under this arrangement we were really 1 hour and 40 minutes ahead of the sun, and following an ordinance by the city council the law has been disregarded.

It gave me pleasure to vote for the repeal of this law when our House bill was up for consideration. Later, when the Agricultural bill came back with Senate rider to repeal the law, although it seemed to me that this was no proper rider for an appropriation bill, I again voted for it, and still again when it came back vetoed by the President. I favored the repeal of daylight saving then and have not changed my position now; there is a bill for that purpose that has passed this House and is now pending in the Senate. I shall support that bill again should it come back to us. I do not understand why that course can not be followed by the friends of this repeal. It seems to me that there must be some purpose in adding this rider to an appropriation bill which does not appear upon the surface. The suspicion is present that some gentlemen who are confident that the President will again veto the entire bill seek to make it appear that he is responsible for delaying payment of salaries to employees in this department. With any such purpose I am not in sympathy; and for the reason that I feel, as the distinguished gentleman from Kansas says he does, that there should be no delay, I shall vote against the daylight rider in this bill, not because I do not want it repealed, for I do, but because I am unwilling to hamper this great department of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CANDLER. The provision in this bill under consideration is the following:

That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States," approved March 19, 1918, is hereby repealed, effective on the last Sunday of October, 1919, after the approval of this act, when by the retarding of one hour the standard time of each zone shall be returned to and thereafter be the mean astronomical time of the degree of longitude governing each zone as defined in section 1 of said act approved March 19, 1918.

Mr. Chairman, this provision, if passed, would only repeal one section—section 3—of the daylight-saving law. It would not repeal all of the law; only one section. I was one of only 40 Members in the House of Representatives who voted against the passage of the daylight-saving bill when it originally passed in the House. I voted to repeal it the first opportunity offered. I voted the other day to pass it over the President's veto. Certainly, then, my record so far as the repeal of the daylight-saving law is concerned is unquestioned and unquestionable. I am against the daylight-saving law and anxious to have it repealed, and being anxious to have it repealed I do not want to see it placed upon this great Agricultural appropriation bill which will force the President again to veto it as well as to veto again the whole Agricultural bill. Now, what is the situation? The repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law was placed as a rider in the Senate on the Agricultural bill and passed the Senate and then the House, and the President, because of that provision, vetoed the whole bill. An effort was made in the House to pass it over the President's veto, and it failed. What

assurance have you if you retain this provision in this bill that the President will not again veto it? You have no assurance whatever that he will not veto it, but on the other hand you have every reason to believe he will again veto the whole bill. In fact you and I are practically certain he will again veto it. Then why willfully endanger all the appropriations for the great Agricultural Department when by pursuing a sensible and reasonable course we can promptly pass this bill and then secure the repeal of the daylight-saving law on its own merits, if we can secure its repeal at all.

Mr. WELLING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANDLER. I am sorry I can not yield; I have not the time. Now, then, if this repeal provision is put upon this bill, if you will examine it, you will see it does not provide for the repeal of the daylight-saving law until the last Sunday in next October. I want to repeal it right now, to-day. You have plenty of time to pass a law to repeal it long before next October. You have got plenty of time. You appear very anxious to-day and show great apparent zeal to put this provision in this bill to repeal this law "next October," when you know it will defeat its repeal and defeat all the appropriations for the whole Agricultural Department. Are you willing to do that? I am not. [Applause.] Besides that, on the last Sunday in October the clocks will be turned back anyway and will not again be turned forward until March, 1920, under the present daylight-saving law as it is on the statute books. Therefore you will have from now until next October to repeal it and accomplish the same result, and not lose a minute of time, and in addition to that you will have six months after the 26th day of next October to repeal it and not take the slightest risk of defeating the Agricultural bill. Now, honestly, do you not believe that would be the safer and better course? Therefore your great anxiety to pass this provision in this bill for the repeal of this law next October, when under the present law the clocks will be turned back then anyway, does not seem to be genuine, but simply appears to be a disposition to play cheap peanut politics in reference to this bill and an effort to slap the President in the face, and if you do that I assure you that you will not secure the passage of the Agricultural appropriation bill or secure the repeal of the daylight-saving bill by any such unbecoming and unseemly tactics. [Applause.] You do not want either to pass the appropriation bill or repeal the daylight-saving law from the course you are pursuing, but to secure, if you can, some cheap political advantage, even at the expense of the general good, because you have every reason to believe the President will veto both again, and you can not pass the bill over his veto, because you have tried it and failed, and if you try it again you will fail again, and you know it. Then why try?

What is the becoming and sensible course to pursue? Eliminate this provision and pass this Agricultural appropriation bill without it, and you know the President will promptly sign it as soon as it reaches him, and the great Agricultural Department can resume its activities, which are now suspended and paralyzed. We have passed the bill repealing the daylight-saving law in the House of Representatives, and it is now pending in the Senate. You Republicans have a majority in the Senate as well as in the House. Let the Senate pass the daylight-repeal bill which has already passed the House and which I voted for, and send it to the President, and if he vetoes it I will vote to pass it over his veto. That is the orderly and becoming way to proceed to secure the passage of this Agricultural appropriation bill and to secure the repeal of the daylight-saving law. If both results can not be obtained in that way, they can not be obtained at all, and you must know it as well as I do. You are not deceiving yourselves, and you will not deceive the people, by your claptrap and apparent zeal when you must know you will only delay what the people desire, to wit, the repeal of the daylight-saving law and the passage of the Agricultural bill, if you persist in this course to include this provision as a rider on this bill. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAYS] said a little while ago, "Let us resort to some expediency." Well, all right; let us resort to some expediency right now and a little common sense as well and eliminate this provision from this bill and pass this Agricultural appropriation bill and secure the approval of it by the President of the United States, and put the Agriculture Department upon its feet again just as soon as possible, and then secure the passage of the bill repealing the daylight-saving law which a large majority in this House and in the Senate favor. If you are sincere, you will do that. If not, you will vote your peanut politics and not vote for the benefit of the Agriculture Department or for the best way to secure the repeal of the daylight-saving law or for the best interests of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.



Mr. CANDLER. I thank you, gentlemen of the House, for your attention and leave the matter with you for your serious consideration and decision. [Applause.]

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

Mr. ELSTON. Does the gentleman wish to extend on the remarks just made or extend his remarks upon another subject?

Mr. SEARS. On the remarks just made.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] suggested a few moments ago that we should put the proposition of repealing the daylight-saving law up to the Senate. "Passing the buck" seems to be the slogan on the Democratic side of the House.

Now, my friends, there is no politics in this issue whatever, notwithstanding the attempt on the part of several Democratic Members to give to it a political tinge. The question of repeal is purely economic. The people generally demand this legislation. It works a hardship on them as well as a financial loss, while only in a comparatively few instances would its repeal work a hardship in the cities.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS] in his speech said that his constituents are practically a unit in demanding the repeal of daylight saving, and yet he is going to follow the President, who has set himself in opposition to the expressed wishes of a majority of the people. I ask you, is that representative government? Are we going to permit the President, who has been absent from this country for many months, and as a result of such absence has got out of touch with the American people to some extent, to dictate to this great legislative body as to what we are to do? Ah, my friends, if such is the case, the Congress of the United States has fallen upon evil days.

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I can not yield to my good friend from Tennessee, for I have but a few minutes remaining.

My friends, there should be no politics in this question, and I am sorry that a large majority of the Democrats have seen fit to line up behind the President on this question, notwithstanding that many of them at heart favor the repeal. I would vote to repeal this law even though it had been vetoed by a President belonging to my own party, for I will not stifle my honest convictions at the behest of any individual; neither will I knowingly vote against the majority sentiment of the people back home, who have been so good to me in the past. We are not here to vote our own sentiments or convictions, but rather to vote and act as those whom we represent wish us to vote. That is my conception of popular government, and I will continue to make that my guiding principle.

This question has been discussed pro and con in Congress, so there is really nothing new that I can bring into the discussion. It is working a positive hardship upon the agricultural classes which is daily resulting in great financial loss. Under the new order our farmers can not get out in the hay and harvest fields until 8 and 9 o'clock in the morning because of the heavy dews, and the hired men in many instances insist on quitting at 6 o'clock so they can go to town. It means that our dairymen must commence milking at 3 and 4 o'clock in the morning. It means too long a day for the housewives both on the farms and in the cities. I have had scores of letters from women in my district asking me to work and vote for this repeal, and I submit that we must take the American mothers into consideration. The sacrifices they made in the late war are without parallel in the annals of history, and God forbid that the day will ever come when we shall turn a deaf ear to their pleadings.

Gentlemen of the committee, this is a burning issue with us. The folks back home are not talking "league of nations," but they are talking for the repeal of the daylight-saving law. With them it is a breathing, pulsating issue, for it affects them vitally. We ought to legislate according to their wishes and best interests and not according to whim and caprice of an individual who has assumed to tell us what we want and need. I, for one, will not take orders from the White House. Mine come from the sixth district in Minnesota. I know no boss save the people of my district. [Applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL].

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote against this bill when it comes up for a vote if it contains this rider. I am opposed to any legislation which contains a rider which is being forced upon the people of this country. The President having vetoed the bill on account of that rider, his veto having

been sustained by the House, this is no method to try to enact such legislation—by rider, the most reprehensible way of making laws.

The people in the large cities throughout the country—those who do the work—are in favor of the present daylight law; and yet some gentlemen coming from various parts of the country, who do not know the cities and do not know the people who live in them, say to you that 90 per cent of the people in those cities do not want the daylight-saving law. They are drawing very heavily upon their imaginations. It is the man who represents the city districts in the East who is closer to the people than the man who represents a country district. The reason for that is that the Representatives from the city districts get an opportunity of going back home and getting in closer touch with their people every week. They know that the working people of this country, including those who do occasionally play lawn tennis if they have the opportunity, are in favor of the daylight-saving law. Hundreds and thousands of employers and the leading newspapers of the country favor the daylight law. And I venture to say this, that the President of the United States has sufficient strength and determination of will to veto this bill again if it comes to him containing this rider. And I will say also that the American people will sustain the President in that view and in that action. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HERSEY].

Mr. HERSEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HERSEY. Mr. Chairman, this situation confronts the House: The daylight-saving repeal has passed this House three times by an overwhelming majority. This House voted the other day on the veto message by an overwhelming majority against the daylight-saving bill. No Member of this House has had his mind changed by the President's veto.

Every Democrat claims that nothing the President has said in his veto message has changed his mind. The President gave no new reasons or arguments to sustain his veto of the bill. On the one hand you have this condition in the country: A corporation called the "Daylight Saving Association," organized in the city of New York, made up of the club and sporting element, has been sending propaganda to all the chambers of commerce in the large cities saying, "Have your secretary send a telegram to your Senators and your Congressman to vote to sustain the President's veto of the daylight-saving bill." That is all you have on one side. On the other side you have the united farmers of this Nation demanding that you keep faith with them and repeal this war-time measure.

This daylight-saving bill is a war measure pure and simple. You never could have enacted it without making it a war measure. You know you could not. You said to the farmers that when the armistice came, when war ceased, you would repeal the law. Now you are refusing to do it. The President is refusing to keep faith with the farmers of this Nation.

Prior to our entrance into the war with Germany and the enactment of this war legislation called daylight saving, the people of this Nation had never had any trouble or inconvenience in adapting their pleasures and their business to the clock—the time as regulated and used for 100 years.

It was thought necessary during the war to use great bodies of workmen in Government industries for the production of war material and to use further all the hours of daylight upon the farm in the production of food products, and the people were called upon everywhere to make special sacrifices during the war that the armies might be trained, clothed, and fed.

Right after the declaration of war, on the 15th day of April, 1917, the President issued his appeal to the people of this country and made this special appeal to the farmers of this Nation:

I take the liberty, therefore, of addressing this word to the farmers of the country and to all who work on the farms: The supreme need of our own Nation and of the nations with which we are cooperating is an abundance of supplies. A food supply, especially for the present year, is superlative.

Without abundant food, alike for the armies and the peoples at war, the whole great enterprise upon which we have embarked will break down and fall. The world's food reserves are low. Not only during the present emergency, but for some time after peace shall have come, both our own people and a large proportion of the people of Europe must rely upon the harvests in America.

Upon the farmers of the country, therefore, in large measure rests the fate of the war and the fate of the nation. May the Nation not count upon them to omit no step that will increase the production of their land or that will bring about the most effectual cooperation in the sale and distribution of their products? The time is short.

It is of the most imperative importance that everything possible be done, and done immediately, to make sure of large harvests. I call upon young men and old alike and upon the able-bodied boys of the land to accept and act upon this duty—to turn in hosts to the farms and make certain that no pains and no labor is lacking in this great matter.

This appeal was followed by this daylight-saving bill as a war measure, and while it met with much bitter opposition from the farmers they finally withdrew that opposition under the assurance from Congress and the President that when the war was over the law should be repealed.

The present Agricultural bill, the first of its kind enacted after the war, carried the repeal of the daylight-saving law. It passed both Houses of Congress with scarcely no opposition whatever and went to the President for his approval. The President, without giving any new reasons whatever for the repeal, vetoed the Agricultural appropriation bill on July 11, and the House on July 14 by a vote of 248 to 135 said that the President was wrong and that his veto did not meet the approval of Congress, but they lacked 8 votes of having the necessary two-thirds to override the veto.

It has been many years since any question has so aroused the farmers of this Nation as has this veto, which has disregarded the rights of those whom the President called upon to help win the war by making every sacrifice.

The farmers of this Nation did make to the very limit the supreme sacrifice. They gave first their sons from nearly every farm, depriving themselves in many cases of sufficient help, and forced the wife and mother, the daughters and little children, to labor in the fields to take the place of the boys who had gone overseas. They labored through every hour of daylight and far into the night to produce food for the Nation and the world. They submitted to extortionate freight rates under Government control of railroads. They obeyed all the war-time rules and regulations of the Food Administration. They saved the Nation and the world in its time of stress and peril, and now when they desire above all things to get back to normal conditions and conduct their farms and business in their own way the President by this veto disregards their rights and ridicules their every protest.

When the brewers and saloon keepers of the Nation appealed to the President to repeal war-time prohibition he sends a message to Congress saying:

The demobilization of the military forces of the country has progressed to such a point that it seems to me entirely safe now to remove the ban upon the manufacture and sale of wines and beers, but I am advised that without further legislation I have not the legal authority to remove the present restrictions. I therefore recommend that the act approved November 21, 1918, entitled "An act to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the purposes of the act entitled 'An act to provide further for the national security and defense by stimulating agriculture and facilitating the distribution of agricultural products,' and for other purposes," be amended or repealed in so far as it applies to wines and beers.

The petitions and prayers of the united farmers of the country must be disregarded while the President is fighting to save the brewery and the saloon.

I am aware that in the past the politicians have considered the vote of the farmers of the country "not worth the powder." They have all professed to be friends of the farmer except when it comes to legislation for his benefit. They are ever ready and willing to flatter the farmers in the press and on the stump and to "farm the farmer" as an easy mark for votes. But that day has gone, and everywhere, in every State of the Union, the farmers to-day are organizing for their mutual benefit. They are forming societies, unions, and organizations to protect the interests of the farm in matters of politics and legislation. The farmer has determined to be no longer ridiculed and disregarded. His rights are as sacred as those of socialistic organizations which inscribe upon their banners "No beer no work." They will be heard. The Members of this Congress who voted to sustain the President in this disregard of the rights of the farmers will find at the next election that they will be disregarded by the farmers of the Nation. Let us have a roll call and put on record those who have not the courage to stand by their own judgment and who refuse to keep faith with the farmers of the Nation.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore].

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this one minute in order to present a city man's view with regard to the question of daylight saving. We are in favor of the daylight-saving law as it now stands. Many of us voted to support the President's veto. I was one of those. This

matter has now come to the committee and to the House, however, in such form that those of us who desire to vote to sustain daylight saving as it now exists may have an opportunity to do so. Some gentlemen misunderstood this rule. It was brought in unquestionably in response to the demands of the farmer constituency, and perhaps of the larger number of those who vote on the Republican side of this House. I am always in favor of reaching the point on a question like this—we are dealing with an appropriation bill—and for that reason voted for the rule, but I reserved to myself the right, which I still reserve, when the opportunity comes, as I expect it will come, to vote for the continuance of the daylight saving as we now have it. And I wish to assure our friends from the city districts that that opportunity will come to-day, and we will have a square vote on the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Rose].

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise merely to add my approval to what has already been said by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore]. I voted for the rule for the same reason as did the gentleman from Pennsylvania, with the express and distinct understanding that opportunity would again be given to vote directly upon the section relating to daylight saving.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Snyder].

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I have not said a word on this floor since the passage of the Indian appropriation bill. I have heard considerable discussion here about the people in the cities favoring the continuance of the daylight-saving act. I represent a district which is very largely industrial, but we have in addition varied agricultural interests. I have made a very careful canvass of my district on this question, and I find that the statements of gentlemen who are saying here that the majority of the people in the cities favor the act are borne out by the information that I get from my district. But I think a majority of the people of my district favor the repeal of the act. I voted the other day to pass the measure over the President's veto. I shall be glad to vote again to-day in the interest of the repeal of the act, believing that I am representing a very large percentage of the sentiment in my own district and a very large percentage of the sentiment of the people throughout the country. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Almon].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, sometime ago we passed through this House a bill repealing the daylight-saving law by an overwhelming majority, and sent it to the Senate. About that time the Senate placed a rider on the Agricultural bill repealing the daylight-saving law, and it was agreed to by the conferees of the two Houses.

The President vetoed this bill because of the provision repealing the daylight-saving law. The veto was sustained in the House for the reason that it did not receive a two-thirds vote.

I voted against the daylight-saving law at the last session of Congress when it was passed. I voted at this session to repeal it and also voted to pass it over the President's veto. The President was within his rights when he vetoed the bill. We who voted to pass it over his veto were within our rights.

The Agricultural appropriation bill which we passed through the House is now in the Senate, and if passed by that body will be approved by the President. The Senate could also repeal the daylight-saving law by adopting the bill which we passed in the House as a separate measure and it could go to the President again in this way. But instead of having that course pursued the Republican majority in the House, for the purpose no doubt of trying to embarrass the President, has reported another Agricultural bill with this rider, knowing that if it is passed and sent to the White House again in the same form it will be vetoed. It looks like small politics on the part of the Republican majority. The President was no doubt willing to assume the responsibility for the little delay caused by his veto, but if this bill is sent back to him again in the same form they will be responsible for the further delay in the passage of this appropriation bill. The great Agricultural Department has been very much embarrassed since the 15th of this month on account of this annual appropriation bill not having passed. The thousands of employees of this department, I am told, are borrowing money and paying 10 per cent interest because they could not be paid their last pay checks.

The repeal of the daylight-saving law would not take effect if passed until next March, so there is plenty of time to consider its passage. Under these circumstances it should not have



been placed as a rider in this bill and should be stricken out when the bill is reached for amendments, and I have no doubt but that it will be.

I am as much in favor of the repeal of the daylight-saving law as any Member of this House, but I am not in favor of delaying the passage of this appropriation bill carrying more than \$33,000,000 when it will in no way aid in the repeal of the daylight-saving law. Further delay in the passage of this bill will paralyze the activities of the Agricultural Department, and it will be no credit to Congress to send back this identical bill to the President which he has vetoed, and it seems to me that it is offered for no other purpose than to try to embarrass the President, and is very small politics to say the least of it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for one minute.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, what the farmers and laborers and merchants and bankers and doctors and lawyers and preachers and all the people in my district want is the repeal of this law, and they do not want any excuse for not repealing it. [Applause.]

My colleagues who do not vote to repeal this law can live until doomsday, and yet they can never properly explain to the people their action for not voting to repeal something that the people do not want. [Applause.]

I am going to vote to repeal this law, even though the President is in favor of it. During the war I sustained and backed up the President by voting for every single thing he requested, but the war is over now, and I am now going to reassume the full duties, functions, and responsibilities of a representative of the people. The President exercises one responsibility—that of the Chief Executive—while I am expected to exercise another—the legislative capacity of a Representative of the people in Congress to carry out their will and desire, and this I am going to do. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I object except as to those who have actually spoken on the bill. I object to those extending remarks who have not spoken on the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask the same privilege.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio also asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, everybody who was in the last Congress knows that I have played no politics on this question. A bill came from the Senate, introduced by a Republican, by Senator CALDER, and although I was then chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and could have introduced a bill of my own had I so desired, I would not ask the committee to report it, but asked the committee to report the bill introduced by Senator CALDER, a Republican. That bill was reported and passed this House. I made every effort, even when I was scarcely able to stand on my feet, to secure consideration of it in the House, and when it was passed only 40 votes were registered against the bill, and of those 40, 36 were Democrats and 4 were Republicans.

Now, when the bill for repeal was reported from the committee of which I still have the honor to be a member I never mentioned politics in relation to it, and it was passed by a vote of 232 to 122. It was moved in the Senate to suspend the rules and make the repeal bill in order on the Agricultural

appropriation bill, and only five or six votes were finally cast against it. It came back here and was agreed to in conference. It was sent to the White House and vetoed, but without my advice.

Are you gentlemen opposed to the repeal of the daylight-saving law, except by a rider on an appropriation bill? Those opposed to the daylight-saving law have almost unlimited strength in the other body, and can pass the bill that we passed; they may be able to pass it by a two-thirds vote. But some gentlemen in here are playing politics of an inconceivably small and contemptible variety, which is demonstrated by the fact that you are trying to force the President to veto this bill again. If you pass this bill with the repeal of the daylight saving in it, he will probably veto it again, and we will sustain his veto again and put the responsibility where it belongs. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has five minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the situation as it presents itself to the committee is this: Some weeks ago, when the Agricultural appropriation bill was about to be considered in this House, an effort was made to induce the Committee on Rules to present a rule making this amendment in order on that appropriation bill. The Committee on Rules, under the very able management of the distinguished Chairman of the Committee of the Whole at the present moment, for some reason or other refused to allow that rule. The Agricultural appropriation bill passed the House and went to the Senate, and the Senate attached an amendment to it repealing the daylight-saving law. That bill came back to the House from conference, and the conference report was agreed to, including the repeal of the daylight-saving law. It was sent to the President with that feature in it. The President, exercising his constitutional right, vetoed that bill, and sent it back to the House. The House sustained the President's veto, although a majority of the House, it is only fair to say, did not vote to sustain the veto.

As soon as it became apparent that under the peculiar circumstances there might be found a method of embarrassing the President of the United States and subjecting him to criticism upon what I conceive to be more or less a comparatively inconsequential proposition, there seems to have been no trouble whatever in inducing the Committee on Rules, which of necessity is the political committee in this body, to report out a rule to this House to-day making in order this proposition, although they would not give it to us before.

Anyone who knows the President of the United States, who has ever looked into his cold, gray eyes, is well aware of the fact that while the provision in this bill differs slightly from the provision sent to him before, when this bill reaches him he will veto it again upon the ground set forth in his former veto message. Now, I am in favor of the repeal of this daylight-saving law myself, and introduced a bill since the signing of the armistice to repeal it. I am in favor of it because I think a majority of the people whom I have the honor to represent in this body desire to have it repealed; but I do not feel that as a sensible man dealing with a situation, dealing with a fact and not a theory, I should stand here and play the childish rôle of doing something that I know we will have to do over again. Therefore I shall vote to strike this out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, our Democratic friends declare themselves in favor of a measure and then declare that they are going to vote against it.

The bill gives an opportunity to again show whether you are for or against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving act. Its history and faults are well known. When the Agricultural appropriation bill was under consideration in the House the first of this session, as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture I offered an amendment to the bill repealing the entire so-called daylight-saving act. A point of order was made against the amendment and sustained.

The Senate inserted the repeal in the Agricultural appropriation bill, and the House, having already passed a separate measure repealing section 3 of the daylight-saving act by a vote of 232 to 122, concurred in the conference report on the Agricultural appropriation bill containing the repeal of the entire act referred to, with little discussion and without a dissenting vote.

The Agricultural appropriation bill was vetoed by the President because it contained the repeal of the daylight-saving act. The House voted 248 to 135 to pass the measure over the President's veto—nearly the necessary two-thirds vote.



In view of the sentiment shown in the House by the votes, the hardship imposed by section 3 of the daylight-saving act, especially upon the farmers, the inconvenience and expense caused in general, the sentiment expressed in numerous resolutions, petitions, and communications addressed to Congress urging its repeal, a majority of the committee again recommended the repeal of section 3 of the daylight-saving act, which section provides that the standard time of each zone shall be advanced one hour during the seven summer months. This would not affect the other sections of the act, which provide for the establishment of standard time and zones and authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to define such zones. In other words, it would simply repeal the daylight-saving provision of the act, and is identical with the amendment which I offered to the Agricultural appropriation bill and to the repeal passed by the House June 18 by a vote of 232 to 122.

In view of the above I, as chairman of the committee, reported the Agricultural appropriation bill, containing the repeal, and requested the Committee on Rules to report a rule making the entire bill in order for immediate consideration so as to expedite its passage. The rule has been reported. The previous question has been ordered. Your opportunity is here. Will you vote for the repeal or will you turn it down? You can not get away from it, gentlemen. You can not deceive the farmers; you can not deceive anybody by the statement that you were for the repeal but voted against it.

All sorts of excuses have been offered for voting against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving act, against the previous question on the rule, and against the main question—the repeal of the act. One excuse advanced by Democratic friends is that this side is playing politics. I assume that every Member will vote his honest convictions in accord with the best interest and the desire of those whom he represents. The contention is that the people in the cities are opposed to the repeal and the people in the country, especially the farmers, are for the repeal. If so, I take it that Members will vote on the question as they have done heretofore. City Members will vote against the repeal and Members representing agricultural districts will vote for the repeal. What is the situation? The Republicans, the majority, are responsible for legislation. The President vetoed the Agricultural appropriation bill because of the clause contained in the bill repealing the daylight-saving act. The department is without legal authority to continue its activities. Not one dollar can be legally expended outside of the permanent annual appropriations. Many employees are without funds to meet their obligations, without money to pay their rent. Instead of making payments on bonds subscribed for they are being compelled to dispose of them at a sacrifice. Everybody knows, every Democratic Member of this House knows, that the plan suggested to reinsert the repeal in the Agricultural appropriation bill is the only one that will expedite the passage of the bill. The proposition is not to obligate anybody to vote for the repeal but to give every Member of this House an opportunity to again vote upon the question, not to vote for or against it but to vote as he pleases.

Now, a word as to the political phase of it. No reference as to what took place in the committee is proper or in order, but the vote just taken upon the previous question on the rule to make the provision for the repeal of the daylight-saving act in order was a test. This is, as before stated, under the rules of the House, the only way in which a vote can be had upon the proposition. The Record will show the fact that every one of the 12 Republican members of the Agricultural Committee voting voted for the previous question, and that every one of the 7 Democratic members voting voted against it; that every one of the 7 Republican members of the Rules Committee voting voted "aye," and that every one of the 4 Democratic members of that committee voting voted "no." So here we have, at least, from the members of the two committees having jurisdiction over the matter an expression as to whether the House shall be given an opportunity to vote upon the question. The Record will show a solid Republican vote for and a solid Democratic vote against it. Judging by the vote and by what has taken place here to-day, it is safe to say that, possibly with one exception, every Democratic member of the two committees voting will record his vote against the repeal provision, so if our Democratic friends raise the issue, if it is any consolation or advantage to them, the Record will tell the story. As far as I am concerned, I am satisfied to stand by the Record and accept the challenge. Now that you have raised the issue, it will not be for my Democratic friends who are doing everything in their power to defeat the repeal of the daylight-saving act, who are not even willing to permit a vote upon the proposition, to say that you were for it. No! The day has passed when campaign promises and the throwing of a few bouquets to the voter just before election will be acceptable.

The voter will hold you to your campaign promises. He will hold that "actions speak louder than words." With the President's veto and the record made here it will not do for any Democratic Member to say to his farmer constituent, who will be compelled to light his lantern, or to stumble around in the dark, in order to do his chores, milk his cows, swill his hogs, and care for and hitch his team in time to take his children to school at 8 o'clock sun time instead of 9 o'clock, that he was for the repeal but voted against it.

The farmer will not accept it. Nor will the employees in the department, in the factory, in the mill, or on the railroads, nor the mothers and children who, in order to get their required rest and sleep, are compelled to go to bed one hour earlier, which is especially undesirable during the summer months, when, owing to the intense heat, it is impossible for them to sleep the first hours of the night, and who are thus deprived of an hour of beneficial rest. Parents and teachers report that a large number of children have failed this year in their studies, due largely to loss of sleep. All agree that refreshing sleep is invigorating to both mind and body, and is as necessary and conducive to health and longevity as food.

If the act can not be repealed, the title of the act, in order to comply with the schedule fixed therein, should at least be changed from "An act to save daylight" to read "An act to compel the housewife to prepare the evening meal in the heat of the middle of the afternoon; the suitor to court his sweetheart in the daylight; the laborer, after his evening meal, to sit on the porch in the heat of the summer and swat flies, go to bed while it is still light, roll around an hour or two in the early part of the hot summer evening, and later be called by the alarm clock in the cool, refreshing hours of the morning; the farmer to stack and thrash his grain wet with the morning dew—not to conserve or increase but to curtail production, to increase the high cost of living, and to do foolish and uncalled-for things too numerous to mention." Why this absurdity? If there is any advantage in advancing the clock, why not improve upon it by advancing it an hour or two more, so that, as suggested, we may eat our evening meal at noon, and then have an opportunity to attend the ball game and matinees?

Why deprive 100,000,000 people of sleep at the proper and God-appointed time in order to give the golf player that extra hour on the golf links and accommodate a few who desire to work on the earlier schedule? Everybody knows no legislation is required to change their schedules. If a change is desired by them, all that is necessary is for the employer and employee to agree to make the change.

What unpardonable sin have the people in the country committed that warrants the discrimination? Have they not done their part? We were at war. The world was short of food. The winning of the war depended upon food as much as upon any other thing. Congress found it necessary to fix the price of wheat at half the price the farmer would have received if the law of supply and demand had not been interfered with. He gave his sons to the Army; his wife and daughters took his sons' place in back of the plow. He bought bonds, he gave to the Red Cross and Young Men's Christian Association. Invariably his hired help quit work at the usual time by the clock, which was an hour early as a result of this unjust and uncalled-for law, and interfering with the law of nature on the farm.

The act not only costs the farmer millions of dollars annually, but curtails production, and thus adds to the already high cost of living to millions of consumers. We have 6,000,000 farmers and 6,000,000 laborers employed on the farm. One hour lost each morning, owing to the dew, to each of the 12,000,000 on the farm is equal to 12,000,000 hours, which is equivalent to 1,500,000 eight-hour days, and that, at a wage of \$4 a day, amounts to \$6,000,000 loss to those on the farm daily at least for every day during the several weeks of haying, harvesting, and thrashing that this absurd law is in effect. In addition, the farmer was compelled to pay millions of dollars additional transportation charges. On the other hand, the millers, the packers, the steel trust, and various other enterprises were put under Government control, either through the license system or by voluntary arrangements. Many contend that the licensing system should be continued, especially as to the packers and other big interests. Railroads were taken over and granted hundreds of millions of dollars compensation in excess of a fair and reasonable compensation. What happened to the millers, the packers, and others under Government control? Millers were permitted to increase their operating profits 175 per cent and on their capital invested 100 per cent.

According to the Federal Trade Commission's report as printed in Senate Document No. 248, Sixty-fifth Congress, second session, page 7:



Five meat packers, Armour, Swift, Morris, Wilson, and Cudahy, and their subsidiaries and affiliated companies have monopolistic control of the meat industry and are reaching for like domination in other products. Their manipulations of the market embrace every device that is useful to them, without regard to law. Their reward, expressed in terms of profit, reveals that four of these concerns have pocketed in 1915, 1916, and 1917 \$140,000,000.

On page 14 it states that "of this astounding figure \$121,000,000 represents excess over their prewar profits." On page 15, tanners are reported to have increased their profits from \$644,390.90 in 1914 to \$3,576,544.27 in 1916. On page 14 it reports the profit made by Morris & Co. for the fiscal year ending November 1, 1917, as 263.7 per cent on the \$3,000,000 capital stock outstanding. On page 9 the steel corporation is reported to have increased its profit of \$46,520,407 in 1914 to \$478,204,343 in 1917, or about 1,000 per cent. Much of these excess profits at the expense of the farmers, who were greatly inconvenienced by this unjust law.

The farmer submitted to all of it. With lantern in hand he started out one hour early; his good wife and sweet daughter helped milk the cows and swill the pigs; his daughter ran the binder; his wife helped shock the grain; and he produced 917,000,000 bushels of wheat—about one-third of the wheat production in all the world. He brought in to market every bushel he could spare at the price fixed by Congress, or at half price. If he did not bring it in, the Government made him, or had some one bring it for him. He produced 5,600,000,000 bushels of cereals—about one-third of the world's production of cereal. The number of head of cattle was increased to 43,000,000; swine to 71,000,000; sheep to 49,000,000; meat, pork, and mutton was increased to nineteen and one-half billion pounds.

Notwithstanding the discrimination and the sacrifices made, will you who vote against the repeal say to your farmer constituent, "I, as your friend and Representative, voted to continue the burden, the discrimination, so that the joy rider, the city chap, might spend an additional hour on the golf links"? Will you say to him, "My vote is recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD July 18; I stand upon my record; I renew all my previous campaign promises and assure you, as I have in the past, of my sincere affection for you and a deep interest in your welfare"? Will you who voted against the repeal say, "You have accepted my promises in the past and have so generously given me your loyal support, if I merit your confidence and a continuance of your support, as a reward for what I have done for you in this matter, kindly continue to rise earlier, forget the President's veto, my vote against the repeal of the daylight-saving law, and vote for me"? According to the sentiment expressed by the hundreds of thousands in communications received, the indications are that he is not likely to forget.

One reason given in the veto message for the vetoing of the repeal of the daylight-saving act is "that in other countries similar legislation has resulted in substantial economy." Society has fallen into the practice of patterning their dress after Paris fashions. Others buy goods made in foreign countries. Has it come to this, that our laws, too, must be patterned after European law?

Another contention is, now that the President has vetoed the bill, there is nothing left for Congress to do but to pass it as it comes back to us. I concede the President's right to veto bills, but I still reserve the right to vote as my conscience dictates. It can never be charged that I am a "rubber-stamp" Congressman. To the contrary, I have always contended against autocracy in this country. Thousands of lives have been sacrificed, hospitals are filled with maimed and wounded, millions of dollars have been spent and millions more will be required to cancel the debt—all to stamp out autocracy across the seas. Our forefathers fought and died that there might be freedom of thought, action, and personal independence. Shall autocracy be tolerated here, or even suggested? Shall it all have been in vain?

I have always supposed that the declaration that this is a government of the people, for the people, and by the people meant just what it implies—a representative form and not a one-man government. With all due respect to those who believe in the concentration of power, who believe that the interests of the people can best be served thereby, I am absolutely opposed to the concentration of legislative power in one man. Mind you, there can be no curtailment of a Member's right and personal independence without invading the rights of the people whom he represents. I believe it is our duty to assert our own right as well as the rights of those whom we represent and to shun unbecoming, unstatesmanlike, and un-American practice. Let us do our sworn duty, vote as our conscience dictates, and assert our rights granted under the Constitution.

I have a right to exercise the privilege of voting for or against the repeal at this time. I propose to exercise it. I do not concede you the right to say that you are for the measure and then do everything you can to defeat it, everything you can

to delay action, giving as an excuse that the President has vetoed it and that you must now take his order as it comes.

Mr. SEARS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HAUGEN. Certainly.

Mr. SEARS. As chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, having the responsibility upon you for this legislation, if the President should veto it again, then what would you do?

Mr. HAUGEN. I will continue to do my duty as I see it, to expedite the consideration of this legislation. Much has been said about the Committee on Rules. The Committee on Rules is responsible to the party for legislation. In order that the passage of the bill might be expedited and that every Member of the House might be given an opportunity to vote upon this all-important question, the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, I requested a rule, and the rule is here. Every vote cast against the rule on that side has been a vote not only to delay the passage of the bill but to defeat it.

The question of repealing the so-called daylight-saving law has been discussed and voted upon first when it passed the House as a separate measure by a vote of 232 for and only 122 against the repeal; second, on the conference report on the Agricultural appropriation bill without a dissenting vote; third, against sustaining the President's veto by almost a two-thirds vote, or 248 to 135.

In view of that I shall not take up further time, except to avail myself of the privilege granted me to extend my remarks by appending telegrams and extracts from communications just received.

One from the chamber of commerce of the capital of my home State, which goes to show that not only the farmers but practically all the people of Iowa are for its repeal:

Good luck to you in your protest against daylight savings. You not only have backing of agriculture and labor but some large organizations. You can't change the law of nature by a statutory law. This best argument against daylight savings.

One from New York State Dairymen's Association:

The dairymen, forming the largest industry in New York, demand the repeal of the daylight-saving law.

One from the Southern Ruralist, Atlanta:

Disappointed at not seeing you yesterday. Wish to assure you farmers of South are almost unanimous in favor of repeal of daylight-saving law. Believe measure and President should have another chance. Industrial interests can adjust themselves to statute law. Farm operations are inevitably controlled by natural law. Farmers have suffered seriously under present law as war measure, and in justice now demand repeal.

One from an Iowa minister:

I notice, with intense regret and chagrin, that Mr. Wilson vetoed the Agricultural bill, in his eagerness to retain the daylight-saving bill. Is it possible that he is to be supreme dictator of our Nation, regardless of the will of the people? Is he going to continue to make a football of Congress? Truly his head must have been turned by the flattery of Europe, that he defies our lawmaking body and aspires to usurp the legislative, judicial, and executive prerogatives of our land. The champion of beer, the peace advocate, and now catering to a few idle rich in the matter of the daylight-saving law. He totally ignores the farmer and the majority millions who proclaim daylight-saving matter a rank fake, dividing country and town and literally ruining the work of the church. Are not our laws to be based upon the "consent of the governed?"

He would imperil the Nation and agriculture, the very heart of the Nation, to satisfy the whim of the idle rich. Put the matter to a universal vote, if necessary, and put up a death struggle to repeal it. The principle of all government is involved in this matter. Write the ministers of America; they know the sentiment of their people. He has thrown down the gauntlet, now let the Republican Party rise up in its might and put this thing across and also sweep the Nation for a new and a Republican President.

The Nation will be behind you. Millions are tired of one-man rule.

One from a professor at Mercer University, Macon, Ga.:

I am writing to commend you for the renewal of the fight for the repeal of the daylight-saving law. I feel that you will be more successful this time.

A large majority uncomplainingly accepted the law as a temporary war measure, believing that it would be promptly repealed after the close of the war. Hence we are well-nigh astounded that President Wilson should by his veto undertake to make permanent this temporary war measure over the wishes of about two-thirds of his people.

Here in Macon churches have changed services from 11 to 12 a. m. and 8 to 9 p. m.; banks have changed opening hours from 9 to 10 a. m.; schools and colleges have also made changes in opening hours, but have failed to satisfactorily adjust matters.

One from the Public School Teachers' Club, New Brunswick, N. J.:

For some unaccountable reason the public press is advocating putting the clocks one hour ahead of honest time. We teachers know that it is undesirable for the pupils and teachers in our public schools, for the children in the elementary grades particularly. Please do what you can to get us honest time all the year round.

About a month ago the National Federation of Labor Unions, at its annual convention held at Atlantic City, N. J., passed a resolution by a large majority condemning this "daylight-saving law." Scores of mothers have told me that all the potentates on earth can not make their children go to sleep an hour earlier than honest time, but it would seem that the law of "the majority rules" does not work in this case. The advocates of this daylight saving seem to think it



is more important to conserve money than to conserve nervous energy. This Republic is dependent upon the welfare of the rising generation. The children need the regular hours of sleep. May you be successful in your efforts to secure honest time for the children and workers of the United States.

Three from the National Grange, Washington, D. C.:

JUNE 7, 1919.

The National Grange, representing more than a million producing farmers, has asked the Congress of the United States to repeal the so-called daylight-saving law.

All agricultural organizations are united in demanding the repeal of this measure, which has caused hardship to all workers, farm workers in particular, every day since it went into effect.

JULY 14, 1919.

In voting to repeal the daylight-saving act Congress met the wishes and had the approval of the farmers of the United States as expressed through their principal organizations, including the National Grange and the National Board of Farm Organizations, the latter including as constituent members the National Farmers' Union, the National Milk Producers' Federation, and others.

All of these combined represent the organized farmers of America. Such daylight-saving act has resulted in a distinct and material loss to farmers, which loss is reflected in both increased cost to consumers and decreased production. No sufficient reason has been advanced for such a change in the custom of generations.

We urge its repeal.

JULY 17, 1919.

The fight for the repeal of the daylight-saving law has not been abandoned, in spite of the President's veto and the failure by a few votes of the House to override it.

President Wilson has been in Paris, busy and out of touch with the real sentiment of the American people. He is hearing things from the farmers and their representatives just now. He will continue to hear.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries, Office of Farm Management: One chief of office, \$5,000; 1 assistant to the chief, \$2,520; 1 executive assistant, \$2,250; 2 clerks, class 4; 2 clerks, class 3; 3 clerks, class 2; 8 clerks, class 1; 3 clerks, at \$1,100 each; 4 clerks, at \$1,080 each; 1 clerk or draftsman, \$1,020; 10 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 18 clerks, at \$900 each; 6 clerks or map tracers, at \$840 each; 1 messenger or laborer, \$720; 1 messenger boy, \$660; 3 messenger boys, at \$480 each; 1 charwoman, \$480; 5 charwomen, at \$240 each; 1 library assistant, \$1,440; one library assistant, \$900; one photographer, \$1,400; 1 cartographer, \$1,500; 1 draftsman, \$1,440; 1 draftsman, \$1,200; 2 draftsmen, at \$900 each; in all, \$84,430.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WINGO. Under the rule, as I understand it, no section of this bill is open to amendment except the last one.

The CHAIRMAN. That is true.

Mr. WINGO. The statement has been made to the House that the bill is the same as that which was agreed to in conference. How are we going to correct it where we find that the bill is not the same, and where one matter is entirely left out? How is the House going to correct it under the rule?

The CHAIRMAN. On the face of the bill—

Mr. WINGO. To give a concrete illustration, the "soft pork" proposition is entirely left out of this bill. When the conference report came in the gentleman from Iowa gave me assurances that it was taken care of, by reducing the item of \$40,000 provided by the Senate amendment to \$20,000.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WINGO. How are you going to reach that?

Mr. HAUGEN. It is in the bill. There is a proposition in the bill to cover that. I refer the gentleman to the gentleman on that side who is responsible for the amendment.

Mr. WINGO. There is no "soft pork" item in this bill. Either the gentleman was incorrect in the assurances he gave me or else he is mistaken now.

The CHAIRMAN. The clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For inspection and quarantine work, including all necessary expenses for the eradication of scabies in sheep and cattle, the inspection of southern cattle, the supervision of the transportation of live stock and the inspection of vessels, the execution of the 28-hour law, the inspection and quarantine of imported animals, including the establishment and maintenance of quarantine stations and repairs, alterations, improvements, or additions to buildings thereon, the inspection work relative to the existence of contagious diseases, and the mallein testing of animals, \$525,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, at the proper time I desire to offer an amendment to strike out the daylight-saving item. When will be the proper time?

The CHAIRMAN. When that paragraph is reached, such a motion will be in order.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I was not here when the rule was read. I have been advised that the reading of the bill should first be completed.

The CHAIRMAN. In answer to the gentleman's parliamentary inquiry, discussion on this item and amendments thereto will be in order when that item is reached in the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States," approved March 19, 1918, is hereby repealed, effective on the last Sunday of October, 1919, after the

approval of this act, when by the retarding of one hour the standard time of each zone shall be returned to and thereafter be the mean astronomical time of the degree of longitude governing each zone as defined in section 1 of said act approved March 19, 1918.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Page 102, line 8, strike out the paragraph.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the passage of this amendment would mean the elimination from the bill of the daylight-saving repealer. I am offering it at this time for the purpose of giving to those who desire to retain the existing law upon the statute books an opportunity to vote. I am quite sure that our friends from the country, who are enthusiastic for the passage of the repealer, will give to those of us who come from other geographical sections and who are in favor of daylight saving an opportunity to express ourselves at this time. I do not object to the appeal coming up from the farming sections of the country, where they seem to think that the daylight-saving law has worked an injustice to them. That is not so much a political question as it is a question of environment. But I assume that our friends from the farming districts, who are always strong and potential in this House, will give to those of us who come from congested centers, who know something about the value of time, who appreciate a little extra daylight and an opportunity to use it, a chance to express ourselves in like manner. Therefore, in order that the issue may be squarely met, I offer the amendment striking out of this bill the daylight-saving repealer. It came in as a rider; it is one that can fairly be knocked out, because the bill already passed by this House—the Esch bill—is more comprehensive, though it has not yet passed another body. Many of my colleagues have expressed the desire, since we passed the rule giving an opportunity for consideration of this entire question, for which rule I voted, to express themselves, and I have taken the opportunity to offer this amendment and give them this chance.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I have voted in favor of the daylight repeal. To do that again and vote to keep it in the bill will only result in its being vetoed again, will it not?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That may be. If we take the word of our friends on the other side of the House, the President will probably adhere to his previous action and veto the bill. If in doing that he offends the farmers of the country, that is neither the gentleman's concern nor mine; that is the concern of the President of the United States.

We have passed a daylight-saving repeal, which is now in the Senate. Gentlemen on the other side have been insisting that the President had it within his constitutional right to veto the bill. Many of them represent farming constituencies, and they are responsible in the votes they cast this day when they predict that the President will adhere to his previous action and still do that thing which it is evident the farmer does not want; that is for them to deal with as they view the situation.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The gentleman says that he offers the amendment so that Members may have the opportunity to register their desire on the matter, but the gentleman offers it in good faith, so that the provision may be stricken from the bill?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Of course, I am for daylight saving. My constituents expect me to vote that way. In another place than this I did vote with the majority of my colleagues to bring this matter on the floor—that was to afford consideration—but I reserved the right to vote as my constituents would have me vote on the question. We should meet an issue like this squarely and have it over.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I shall support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] to strike from this bill the section which would repeal section 3 of the daylight saving act. As one of the Committee on Agriculture, I strongly opposed the inclusion of this section in this bill, believing that it was unwise to do so and not proper here, in view of the fact that the President had vetoed the bill on account of the inclusion of this provision.

I have been somewhat inconsistent with respect to this daylight-saving matter. I voted against the Esch bill, because I believed in daylight saving. Later, however, as one of the conferees of the House, consulting with the conferees of the Senate, in the trading and dickering that was necessary for us to do in order to reach an agreement on the large number of Senate amendments, I agreed to accept the Senate amendment to repeal the daylight-saving act, and when the bill was returned to the



House I voted to adopt the conference report which contained the repeal provision. When the bill was returned to the House, having been vetoed by the President, I voted to pass the bill over his veto. My later votes were in keeping with the large majority sentiment of my committee and in keeping with the action of the conferees. In order to reach an agreement with the Senate it was necessary for us to accept the amendment repealing the daylight-saving law. But I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the matter should have rested there and that neither the Committee on Agriculture nor the House itself should have given further attention to the matter. Some of the Members resent the President's action. I have differed from him in his method of trying to influence legislation. I have at times resented his interference because I believed that he was doing it improperly and in an unwarranted way. But respecting this matter, he has proceeded entirely in keeping with the Constitution and has been entirely within his right. After the vote was taken in the House to pass the bill over his veto, and the effort to override the veto failed, my judgment was and is now that we should respect it, and that it was not becoming of us to reinsure this matter and throw it back in his face again. [Applause.]

I am led to that opinion also because of the condition in which the Department of Agriculture is and will find itself on account of the delay in the passage of the bill. Until this becomes a law there is no provision carrying authority or money for any of the activities of the Department of Agriculture. These activities are numerous and many of them are very important, and because the bill failed to become law before the beginning of the new fiscal year many of them have been, and still are, suspended.

The department is very seriously embarrassed and will be more and more so as time goes on until this bill or some bill shall be passed. This condition is very much to be regretted, and I should very much regret to see the House responsible for continuing the trouble. As was said a few minutes ago by a gentleman speaking of this matter, many of the employees of the department, unable to obtain their semimonthly salaries on the 15th, were obliged to borrow money, and they find themselves seriously embarrassed and have suffered loss. This unfortunate condition must not be permitted to continue, as I believe it will be continued, if this repeal section is included in the bill again sent to the President and again vetoed by him. Having availed ourselves of the privilege the Constitution gives us of trying to pass it over the veto, and having failed, in my judgment it is not becoming in us again now, without any change whatever of facts or circumstances respecting the matter, to try to pass the bill in the same form. [Applause.]

Another thing that moved me to oppose the inclusion of this paragraph is that this House in an orderly way a few weeks ago passed what is known as the Esch bill, which repeals section 3 of the daylight-saving law, or will repeal it if it shall become a law. That is the section that provides for the turning back and the turning forward of the clocks. That is the section and the operation under it that it is said is so much objected to by the farmers of the country. That bill is now in the Senate. It can be taken up and passed at any time in short order. In 15 minutes, if the Senate will give consideration to the bill, it can be passed and will go to the President. That is the orderly way for Congress to proceed. This section we are now considering is a "rider" on an appropriation bill, always an objectionable feature in legislation, something that we inveigh against, something that the country disapproves. This ought not to be the manner of attempting to deal with so important a matter. In my judgment we would be moving with decent respect for the opinion of the country, with proper consideration for the Department of Agriculture, and with proper respect for the President of the United States if we should eliminate this section. [Applause.] There is a decent and orderly way to proceed; let us take that way. There is a becoming way to treat and to do business with the Executive, widely as we may differ from him; let us pursue that way.

The responsibility for delay and for the unfortunate condition in the department thus far is upon the President. He is evidently willing to assume it. If further delay shall occur—and I feel sure it will, a serious delay—the responsibility will be on us, and I for one am not willing to assume it; and I trust that the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be adopted. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in opposition to this amendment. No one can doubt the right of the President to exercise his judgment in vetoing the recent Agricultural bill. I take issue squarely, however, with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN], who says that if we include this in the bill under consideration and another veto should follow, the responsibility will rest upon us. It will rest where the responsibility now rests for delay in the passage of

this bill to supply the Department of Agriculture. [Applause.] Congress passed the recent Agricultural bill in due time. If the man who had the constitutional right to veto that bill had been on the ground, where he was expected to be, in the discharge of official duties, that veto could have been here and the whole thing disposed of long ago. [Applause.] We are now called upon to consider this question anew. Two hundred and forty-eight Members of the House voted to override that veto and one hundred and thirty-five Members voted to sustain it. Count up the population according to the ratio of representation in this House. Where do you have the expression of judgment as to the comparative strength of the voting population of the Nation in regard to the retention or repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law. Fifty-two million people against it and only twenty-eight million for, according to the census of 1910. There it stands, almost 2 to 1.

The farmers of the country are united in demanding the repeal of that law. No one on this floor, no one in a veto message, has yet pointed out any valid reason that will override the objections presented by the agricultural interests of the country with relation to this matter. I challenge you to study the whole record of the debate, and put the volume of population that voted by representatives in this House for the repeal over against the population of the country that voted to sustain the law. Some seem to think that there is no special inconvenience for a farmer to be called out at 3 o'clock in the morning instead of 4, in the busiest time of the year, in order to make trains with his dairy products and in order to carry on the regular demands of farm life.

Many have suggested in this debate that it is far more desirable that a few men shall have the pleasure of an automobile ride at the latter end of the day, while the farmer takes the inconvenience of an hour at each end of the day.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. I have not the time. It is absolutely impossible for us to place this so-called daylight-saving law in keeping with the convenience and interests of the agricultural sections of the country. Men may think that by statute the Congress of the United States can change the nature of the rooster that crows at the stated time in the morning, but when the rooster crows and looks at the clock and sees that he is an hour ahead of time, he says the clock is a liar, and that the man who voted for that law was not quite so wise as the rooster himself. You enacted it as a war measure and promised that you would repeal it at the close of the war. That assurance was given here and also at the White House.

Will you now turn your backs upon that pledge and repudiate that promise?

There is no doubt as to the serious inconvenience to the agricultural interests of the country. Will you stand against them? Will you stand against the united judgment of the farmers of the Nation and say that this so-called daylight-saving law shall be perpetuated? Have we not a right to reconsider and send it back to the President with a request that he likewise reconsider rather than stand against the interests of the farmers of the Nation? I think we should do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. To speak to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is exhausted.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word of the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

I agree with the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. ANDREWS] that the President had the right to veto this provision which is under consideration, but there are many things which the ordinary citizen and which even the President of the United States has a right to do that he ought not to do under the circumstances, and this is one of them. [Applause.] If there is any privilege, if there is any right, that the ordinary citizen of the United States has it is to say what time he shall get up in the morning. He knows best when he ought to commence his duties. The President of the United States, no matter how great his knowledge, how great his skill, no matter how much information he may have acquired over in Europe on this subject, can not give him any information on that line.

The representatives of the people, the men who know the opinion of the people of the country, the men who know what the people want, by an overwhelming majority have said that the people of these United States want this law repealed. The demand comes from the farmer, from the laborer; and who are opposed to that demand? The golf player and the joy rider.

Those are the principal parties who are opposed to the repeal of this law.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I am unable to yield. I have only five minutes. Every man in this House who has worked on a farm—and there are many of them, including myself—knows that the farmer can not properly carry on his work under such regulations that this present law imposes. He knows that this is a matter of justice to the farmer; it is a mere matter of pleasure and convenience to those who are opposed to it. The farmer's hours are long at best, his work hard and toilsome. For a long time conditions of work have been so much easier in the cities that there is a constant drift toward them, a tide that ought to be turned, if possible.

The laborer, too, realizes, that this new time is no benefit to him. He loses the cool early morning hour for sleep. He can get no more done and is not so comfortable. The merchants of the small town almost unanimously voted the new time to be a nuisance.

That is the situation here, but they tell us if we submit to the veto of the President everything will go on nicely with the Department of Agriculture. Why is it that the employees of the Department of Agriculture are not getting their pay? It is not because of this House—this House voted their pay long ago—but because the President stubbornly, ill-advised, uninformed, insisted on opposing the wishes of the people, and determined that these employees should not receive their pay. Of course, we could always give up our rights. Congress can surrender any right that it has and submit to one-man rule, but the President of the United States has no more right to demand that of us than we have now to insist that this question shall again be put up to him for his decision. We hope by this time that he has remained in this country long enough to be better informed upon the situation. [Applause.]

Mr. PLATT, Mr. HAUGEN, and Mr. KINCHELOE rose.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa. The gentleman from Iowa moved to strike out the last word.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized to strike out the last two words.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I hope this will not be taken out of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. It will not be.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, have not I the right to recognition in opposition to the amendment before a new amendment is offered by a gentleman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky, the Chair understands, is in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I think there has been more inconsistency indulged in by the Republican side of this House on this amendment to-day than any I have ever heard since I have been here. As far as I am concerned, I voted against the enactment of the daylight-saving law originally in war time, I voted for the repeal of the daylight saving, I voted to override the veto of the President, and I am still for the repeal of the daylight-saving law. But here is the situation: You who say that you are consistently in favor of the repeal of the daylight-saving law have voted on that in a separate bill that was brought here from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for its repeal. It passed this House on the 18th day of June. It is now pending in the Senate. Then how can you get this bill repealed any sooner by voting to keep this rider on the Agricultural bill when the bill that passed the House June 18 is now pending in the Senate? It is a question that when you vote to retain this rider you vote to embarrass the President. You know if you vote the retention of this rider in this bill it is putting it up to him in the same form it was before; and you are not going to back him off the boards on this proposition, and you need not be uneasy about it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is a question of petty politics, and you are going to get the hot end of it so far as playing the President off the boards is concerned and delay the enactment of this great Agricultural appropriation bill, which involves great agricultural activities throughout the country. Why do you want to keep this in here when a bill has already been passed by the House repealing the law, when the question was met squarely in the face and not as a rider on an appropriation bill but as an original proposition itself?

I am frank to say that while I voted against the law when it was originally enacted, while I was in favor of the repeal of it,

while I voted to override the President's veto, yet I do not propose by my vote now to let go unenacted this great Agricultural appropriation bill. As said by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN], the Senate can pass the House bill over there in 15 minutes. So it is a question with us as Members of this House that by voting against the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania—and I am as much for the repeal of the daylight-saving law as any of you—we are voting to hold up this great Agricultural appropriation bill which will paralyze the great agricultural activities of this country simply to play a petty game of politics and undertake to play the President off the boards. You will find yourselves badly mistaken in that proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO], the gentleman made a statement a few minutes ago that he had been deceived by the chairman of the committee. I desire to call his attention to the fact he has not been deceived. First, I call his attention to the report made by the conferees, and if he will turn to page 1 he will find this language:

That the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "\$327,680"; and the Senate agree to the same.

If he will turn to page 17 of the bill, he will find that the amount is increased from \$307,680 to \$327,680; that \$20,000 was added to the appropriation for the investigation. If the gentleman is not satisfied, I refer him to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], who is satisfied and had this matter in charge.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, this question has been discussed at various times and passed on by the House. It is getting pretty late. Is it not possible that we can reach some agreement as to the conclusion of the debate? I move that all debate on this question close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa moves to close debate in 20 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak for the amendment.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time be controlled by the gentleman from South Carolina and myself, to be equally divided.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the time be equally divided by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] and himself. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DONOVAN].

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, in my opinion the whole gamut and range of discussion on the daylight-saving law has been exhausted, and yet it appears to me most unfortunate that there has been an element engendered in the debate which really is something that we do not desire to be said of ourselves. Reference has been made to the why and wherefore of the President in vetoing the Agricultural bill; the psychology of his mind has been gone into, and yet we are jealous of a great prerogative which is ours, namely, not to be questioned on or reprimanded for any vote or attitude we may take in this great lawmaking body in regard to the enactment of legislation. Without going further to cite instances, it seems to me that this procedure is a great mistake. I believe we should consider this matter independent of the personal attitude of anyone and solely on its merits.

There was some discussion during the debate in which the charge was made that the great financial interests of the country were back of the objection to the repeal of the daylight-saving law, because if repealed they would lose a few hours' profit on interest charges. It was ludicrous. It was the essence of simplicity. It was almost imbecility. Yet it was seriously propounded by a Member in good faith.

I do not think any one Member can speak for the great American public on this most vital subject absolutely and in toto. There are men here who proudly expand their chests and who figuratively decorate themselves with distinguished-service medals for having acquired that knowledge and belief. In my humble opinion we but reflect the sentiment of our several districts and our several communities. The sentiment of the district I represent is overwhelmingly in favor of the retention of the daylight-saving law, but yet we are told that the farmers are, or should be, by divine right or otherwise, the principal class to be considered, and as they demand the repeal it should be enacted.



Since the beginning of the debate I observed in the RECORD of the 15th instant a communication from the Massachusetts Tuberculosis League to Senator DAVID I. WALSH, of that State, relating to this subject, which strongly appeals to me. If there is a reason of superlative import that appeals to all genuine and humane Americans for the retention of this beneficial law, it is the reason given in this communication, which is as follows:

MASSACHUSETTS TUBERCULOSIS LEAGUE,  
Boston, June 30, 1919.

Senator DAVID I. WALSH,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: This letter is written on behalf of the executive committee of the Massachusetts Tuberculosis League for the purpose of urging you to use your influence to secure the veto of the repeal of the daylight-saving law, which is now in the hands of the President.

At its meeting on June 27 the committee unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas the Massachusetts Tuberculosis League has always advocated the use of a maximum amount of sunlight and fresh air as a means of prevention and cure of tuberculosis; and

"Whereas the said league considers the present daylight-saving law an aid in preserving the general health of the country, and in particular a great help in the prevention of tuberculosis: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Massachusetts Tuberculosis League views with concern the present effort to do away with the daylight-saving law, and hereby urges the President to veto the repealer now in his hands."

VINCENT Y. BOWDITCH, M. D.,  
"EDWARD O. OTIS, M. D.,  
"ROGER L. LEE, M. D.,  
"DONALD B. ARMSTRONG, M. D.,  
"VANDERPOEL ADRIANCE, M. D.,  
"GEORGE L. SCHATZ, M. D.,  
"MISS LOUISA P. LORING,  
"Executive Committee."

Earnestly hoping that you will take any action which may seem to you to be possible and expedient under the circumstances, I am,  
Respectfully, yours,

R. V. SPENCER,  
Executive Secretary.

Gentlemen, if we wish to get an ascertainment of a genuine, earnest reason for the retention of the daylight-saving law on the statute books, I know of no stronger advocacy, I know of no stronger or more potent reason, that transcends all the slush, all the hypocrisy, and all the insincerity that has been advanced in argument by the opposition in behalf of the farmers, than to give more opportunity for the enjoyment of daylight and sunshine and the hope of aspiration and restoration to health and energy to those stricken with the insidious germs of the devouring white plague. [Applause.]

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. FESS having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Dudley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill H. R. 7343, the sundry civil appropriation bill.

#### AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, the statement is repeatedly made by our good friends on this side of the House that the Republicans are playing politics in again putting before the President this question.

Now, gentlemen, let us see whether or not that is a justifiable accusation. The President, when he vetoed this message, had returned from Europe only a very few days. He could not have ascertained with any degree of certainty the sentiment of the people of this country. And yet, gentlemen, listen to what he says. In closing the veto message the President used this language:

It, moreover, served the daily convenience of many communities of the country in a way which gave all but universal satisfaction.

Is any gentleman on this floor able to say that the President knew the truth when he claimed that this law was giving "all but universal satisfaction"? Let us see what he further said. I read:

And the overwhelming testimony of its value—

That is, of the daylight-saving law—

The overwhelming testimony of its value which has come to me convinces me that I should not be justified in acquiescing in its repeal.

The overwhelming testimony that was given to the President was all one way, and the President was grossly and egregiously deceived. That is the fact in regard to the matter. There is not any question about what the people of the United States think about it. Instead of the overwhelming testimony being opposed to the repeal of this law, it is the other way.

And now, gentlemen, is it unwise for you, or is it unwise for us, to say to the President, "You were mistaken when your advisers told you that the overwhelming sentiment of this country was against this repeal. You have had time now to know better. We are giving you this information. We put this up to you now again, respectfully, for your consideration. The overwhelming testimony is for its repeal." There is no politics in that, gentlemen.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. LIEVER. Mr. Chairman, I will yield three minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. SIMS. Now, gentlemen of the House, I hope to have your attention, especially on this side.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMS. Now, gentlemen, let us take a practical, common-sense view of this matter. This rule in its nature is revolutionary. It is assuming that the President was not well informed or was not sincere in his veto to now bring in the identical legislation, in effect if not in words, and put it up to him again.

Let us see what we are going up against. Suppose we pass this appropriation bill with this rider in it and the President vetoes it, and the veto is again sustained. Then there is just as much common sense and just as much practical sense and just as much reason in bringing in another bill and having a rider on it as there is to have it on this bill.

I did not dream that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] or anyone else on that side was going to offer the amendment that he did. This amendment solves the whole problem. If this amendment is agreed to, the appropriation bill is passed on its merits.

This repeal rider is not in support of any provision in the appropriation bill. This is not the last day or the last week of an expiring Congress, and the law itself in this rider does not take effect until the last Sunday in October, so that there is no emergency about this matter, not a particle. Why should you pursue a course which might never end, because you can repeat the same thing from now until the 1st of January? The President can veto this bill. Under our parliamentary rights we can bring in a new rule to cover the same old question over and over. Why do you want to invite such a thing as that?

The idea of gentlemen telling me of the President being now rightly informed and changing his mind! I want to ask: How in the world do you know? Have you been talking with him? Have you had anything from him that warrants such a conclusion? If so, he will not veto the other bill passed by the House in the proper way when it is passed in the Senate. No; the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] proclaims that the President will not veto this bill. If he is correct as to this bill, we can rest assured that he will not veto the other. So you are driven into a hole and are playing small politics in a small way. I do not mean to say that you have not the right to do it, but this farce can and will continue just as long as the bill is passed, vetoed, and returned. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am earnestly in favor of the repeal of the daylight-saving law. I voted for its repeal when it was under consideration sometime ago, and I also voted to pass the bill to repeal this law over the President's veto.

I am always glad to follow the leadership of the President when I can do so and at the same time follow the light of my own convictions and the wishes of my constituents; but when

this can be done only by stifling my convictions and running counter to the expressed desires of the people whom I have the honor to represent, then I prefer to follow them rather than the President of the United States [applause], though I have great respect and admiration for him.

In my opinion the people of the United States are extremely desirous of getting back to normal conditions and getting away from the irritating, disturbing, and vexatious conditions that were made necessary in order to win the war. They submitted to these war-time regulations patiently and uncomplainingly while necessary, but now that the war is over they are tired of such regulations and their patience is becoming rapidly exhausted. Since the veto message was received I have had numerous letters and petitions from the people of my district urging that I do all in my power to bring about the repeal of this law, and I feel that I should be derelict in my duty and not responsive to the sentiment of my constituents if I did not, even in the face of the President's veto, do all in my power to stand by and reflect the views, sentiments, and desires of the people of my district. [Applause.]

I have no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that a large majority of the people of the entire country favor the repeal of this legislation. The President, having been abroad for several months dealing with great international problems in his efforts to better world conditions and reach an agreement with the other great nations whereby wars in future will be minimized or made impossible, has not had the opportunity Members of Congress have had of ascertaining public sentiment in regard to this very important matter. I feel that the repeal of this law, which was enacted especially to meet war-time conditions, would meet with the approval of the majority of the people of this country, and I am certain that in casting my vote for its repeal I am reflecting the sentiment of the people of my district in their desire to have repealed a law that has accomplished the purposes for which it was enacted. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GARLAND].

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Chairman, I have heard some talk here of evidence in this matter as to whether the daylight-saving law has been valuable or not. I am for the amendment. I think we ought to retain the daylight-saving law until some evidence is shown against its value. It is said that 1,200,000 tons of coal have been saved by the daylight-saving clause in one year. I understand that the evidence given to the President the other day was that \$520,000,000 worth of vegetables were raised in war gardens by the people of this country in one year because of that hour of daylight saving. To show that those who express a desire to have this daylight-saving law repealed now are not in earnest about it, I only wish to say that if there is a real desire to have this law changed, if there is any reason why it should be changed, why can it not wait until next winter, why can it not wait until we have some evidence on the other side? Gentlemen talk about evidence. What is the evidence? They say the farmers want the repeal of this law. I worked for five years on a farm when I was a boy, and a farmer's hours are from the early crack of daylight until the last wagging of the tail at night. The hired man said to the hired girl, "John stayed till 1 o'clock this morning." "How do you know?" "Why, he was here when I got up to do the chores this morning." [Laughter.] That is an evidence of how they work on the farm. [Applause.]

There should be hearings held if this law is to be repealed and careful investigation of the value or nonvalue made. The element of moral value in people working what is known as war gardens, and the health derived as well as the value in food products, would be enlightening and fruitful.

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT].

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to my beloved friend, the Congressman at large from Pennsylvania [Mr. GARLAND], in order that you may know that there is far from entire accord and unanimity in Pennsylvania favoring the retention of the so-called daylight law, I wish to say that while I have never been a farmer, like Mr. GARLAND, I expect some day to be one, and that is one reason why I want this daylight-saving law repealed. But there are other reasons, and many have been given here to-day. It has been said here that the farmers alone are interested in this matter; but that is far from the fact. I was very much surprised this morning to find in my mail an observation on a criticism made by a very dear friend who happens to be a Democratic editor and a great admirer of the President of the United States. Dr. John B. Griffith, an eminent physician of Lewistown, Pa., wrote me a letter, which I incorporate below. Lewistown is the center of great manufacturing establishments, and, following the course I have always pursued

toward the workingmen, I would under no circumstances vote for the repeal if such action could possibly work them injury. While they can be subjected to no loss or inconvenience, the repeal of the law will be of inestimable value to the farmer, who should be encouraged to produce more rather than less, and to second the force of this argument I need but call attention to the high prices prevailing for food, which, to bring down to normal, every possible expedient should be employed. [Applause.]

[Dr. Griffith's letter.]

LEWISTOWN, PA., July 17, 1919.

Hon. B. K. FOCHT,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: The attached clipping from our daily paper is not my understanding of the sentiment in this locality. The sooner you get the absurd law repealed the better.

Cordially, yours,

J. B. GRIFFITH.

The clipping to which the above letter refers is as follows:

[From the Lewistown Sentinel.]

Congressman Focht is desirous of reflecting the sentiment of his district, but I doubt if he did it when he voted to override the President's veto of the daylight-saving repeal. The opposition to the daylight saving was very largely in the West and South. It seems to me that the change of an hour in that time is eminently satisfactory to the people of this section. It gives them so much more daylight every evening either for enjoyment or for home work and gardening. It is claimed that the farmers are against this daylight saving, but their position seems more selfish than anything else. The farmer can go to work and quit when he pleases, as he has always done. I would think that our Congressman's vote was a purely political one, moved by his implacable opposition to anything that comes from Wilson. A majority of Pennsylvania's Congressmen were more considerate. Eleven voted to override the veto, but 19 voted to sustain it.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CAMPELL of Kansas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 7413, the Agricultural bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill and joint resolution of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 7343. An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 73. Joint resolution authorizing the President to extend invitations to other nations to send representatives to the World Cotton Conference to be held at New Orleans, La., October 13 to 16, 1919, inclusive.

ARMY AND NAVY PROMOTIONS (H. DOC. NO. 153).

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I take the liberty of calling your attention to a matter which I am sure is at the heart of the whole country, and which I have had very much in mind throughout all these months when we were trying to arrange a peace that would be worthy of the spirit and achievements of the men who won the victory in the field and on the sea. After mature reflection, I earnestly recommend that you give the permanent rank of general to John J. Pershing and Peyton C. March, expressing the law in such a way as to give precedence to Gen. Pershing; and that you give the permanent rank of admiral to William S. Benson and William S. Sims. I take it for granted that I am only anticipating your own thoughts in proposing these honors for the men upon whom the principal responsibilities devolved for achieving the great results which our incomparable Navy and Army accomplished.

THE WHITE HOUSE, 18 July, 1919.

WOODROW WILSON.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to amend by making Woodrow Wilson permanent President of the United States? [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is out of order. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.



Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas in the chair.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan was given leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman. [Applause; Members rising.] Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I would be without the semblance of feeling if my heart did not overflow at the beautiful non-partisan reception you have just tendered me. It is all unexpected, for I rose with the intention of demonstrating beyond peradventure the awfulness of those who sit to my left. It is likely that this is the last time that I shall ever address the membership of the House of Representatives. The position to which I go was tendered to me, and I go to it untrammelled by any thought save that of the best interests of the country. I have served in this body for nearly 18 years, and yet I am a comparatively young man. I felicitate myself that I am a more or less close observer and a good judge of men, and I want to say that there has never been gathered together on the face of the earth a body of men who more nearly represented the Christian and patriotic character and courage of their people, such as the people of the United States, as now faces me. [Applause.] There is more ability brought together here than in any similar body that assembles on the face of the earth. [Applause.] I believe there is more patriotism. [Applause.] It seems to me during my many years of service that while we have our political differences and our fun and our frolics, when we reach a period of seriousness the one thought is the best interest of those we serve. [Applause.] There is not a man in this body to-day that I would not trust to the very limit, even to the keeping of the honor of my family and of my home. [Applause.] As I leave you soon, I want everyone of you to know that I shall carry with me the profoundest respect and admiration for you as a body and an affectionate and tender regard for every Member of you personally. [Applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I need not say that it is with universal regret to every Member in this House that the distinguished Member from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] is to leave this membership [applause]; that we are no longer to have the benefit of his good counsel. He is a man of industry and intelligence; he has performed his duty with fidelity, rectitude of purpose, and with a firm determination to do justice and right. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for one minute.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to call the committee's attention to this proposition. I do not believe there is anything in the argument made to this House that the House by passing this bill demanded by the farmers of this country, the Agricultural bill, is mistreating anyone. Who is the Agricultural Department in the interest of? Who is it for? The clerks over here? Is that all—to appropriate money to pay the heads of the department and their clerks? The farmers, it is said, constitute a little over one-third of the people. The gentleman from Illinois said that all the farmers of the United States are demanding this legislation. He calls our attention to the fact that only one-third are farmers. The other two-thirds are willing to use what the farmer raises or produces for them, but they are not willing that they shall have anything to say about the law on the subject. [Applause.] The proposition for this side of the House is who will you obey, your constituency or some one else? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired, and all time has expired. The question is on the motion to amend offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, on a division there were—144 ayes and 125 noes.

Mr. HAUGEN and Mr. SNELL and Mr. BLANTON demanded tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania and Mr. HAUGEN.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were 165 ayes and 123 noes.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with amendment to the House, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to, and that as amended the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, reported

that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 7413, the Agricultural appropriation bill, and had directed him to report the same back with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule which the House has adopted the previous question is ordered on the bill and amendment to final passage. The first question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. CARTER. To ascertain what is before the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair stated explicitly that the amendment is before the House, the only one adopted. The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 203, nays 171, not voting 56, as follows:

## YEAS—203.

Ackerman	Dyer	Larsen	Pou
Alexander	Eagan	Lehlbach	Radeliffe
Almon	Edmonds	Leshner	Rainey, J. W.
Aswell	Elston	Lever	Raker
Babka	Evans, Mont.	Linthicum	Ramsey
Bacharach	Fields	Loneragan	Randall, Calif.
Bankhead	Fisher	Longworth	Rayburn
Barkley	Fitzgerald	Luce	Reber
Bee	Flood	Lufkin	Robinson, N. C.
Benson	Fordney	McAndrews	Rogers
Black	French	McArthur	Romjue
Blackmon	Fuller, Mass.	McDuffie	Rose
Bland, Mo.	Gallagher	McKiniry	Ruby
Bland, Va.	Gallivan	McLane	Rucker
Booher	Gandy	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sanders, La.
Box	Ganly	MacCrate	Sanford
Briggs	Gard	MacGregor	Scott
Brinson	Garland	Madden	Sears
Britten	Garner	Magee	Sherwood
Browning	Garrett	Major	Siegel
Brumbaugh	Glynn	Mansfield	Sims
Buchanan	Godwin, N. C.	Mapes	Smith, Mich.
Burdick	Goldfogle	Mays	Steele
Burke	Goodwin, Ark.	Mead	Stephens, Ohio
Byrnes, S. C.	Graham, Pa.	Merritt	Stevenson
Byrns, Tenn.	Greene, Mass.	Michener	Summers, Tex.
Caldwell	Griffin	Miller	Taylor, Ark.
Campbell, Pa.	Hardy, Colo.	Minahan, N. J.	Temple
Candler	Hardy, Tex.	Montague	Tinkham
Cantrill	Harrison	Moon	Tradway
Carew	Haskell	Mooney	Upshaw
Carss	Hayden	Moore, Pa.	Vaile
Casey	Heflin	Moore, Ind.	Venable
Chindblom	Hersman	Morin	Vinson
Clark, Fla.	Holland	Nelson, Mo.	Walsh
Coady	Humphreys	Newton, Minn.	Watkins
Collier	Husted	Nichols, Mich.	Weaver
Crago	Hutchinson	Nolan	Webb
Crisp	Igoe	O'Connell	Webster
Crowther	James	Ogden	Welling
Cullen	Johnson, Miss.	Oldfield	Welty
Currie, Mich.	Johnston, N. Y.	Oliver	Whaley
Dallinger	Kahn	Olney	White, Me.
Darrow	Kearns	Osborne	Wilson, Ill.
Davis, Tenn.	Kelly, Pa.	Padgett	Wilson, La.
Dent	Kennedy, R. I.	Palge	Wilson, Pa.
Donovan	Kincheloe	Parker	Wingo
Doremus	Kitchin	Pell	Winslow
Drane	Klecza	Peters	Woods, Va.
Dunn	LaGuardia	Phelan	Young, Tex.
Dupré	Lankford	Platt	

## NAYS—171.

Anderson	Davis, Minn.	Houghton	Monahan, Wis.
Andrews, Md.	Dempsey	Howard	Mondell
Andrews, Nebr.	Denison	Huddleston	Moore, Ohio
Anthony	Dickinson, Iowa	Hudspeth	Morgan
Ayres	Dominick	Hulings	Mott
Baer	Doughton	Hull, Iowa	Mudd
Barbour	Dowell	Jacoway	Murphy
Begg	Dunbar	Jeffers	Nelson, Wis.
Bell	Elliott	Johnson, S. Dak.	Newton, Mo.
Benham	Ellsworth	Johnson, Wash.	Nicholls, S. C.
Blanton	Emerson	Jones, Pa.	Overstreet
Boles	Esch	Jones, Tex.	Park
Bowers	Evans, Nebr.	Juul	Parrish
Brand	Evans, Nev.	Kendall	Quin
Brooks, Ill.	Fess	Kennedy, Iowa	Ragsdale
Brooks, Pa.	Focht	Kinkaid	Rainey, H. T.
Burroughs	Foster	Knutson	Ramseyer
Butler	Frear	Kraus	Randall, Wis.
Campbell, Kans.	Fuller, Ill.	Lampert	Reavis
Cannon	Good	Langley	Reed, N. Y.
Caraway	Goodykoontz	Lanham	Rhodes
Carter	Graham, Ill.	Layton	Ricketts
Christopherson	Green, Iowa	Lazaro	Riddick
Clark, Mo.	Hadley	Little	Robison, Ky.
Classon	Hastings	Lubring	Rodenberg
Cole	Haugen	McCulloch	Sanders, Ind.
Connally	Hawley	McFadden	Sanders, N. Y.
Cooper	Hays	McKenzie	Saunders, Va.
Copley	Hernandez	McKeown	Sells
Cramton	Hersey	McKinley	Shreve
Curry, Cal.	Hickey	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sinclair
Dale	Hill	McPherson	Sinnot
Davey	Hoch	Martin	Sisson

Small	Strong, Kans.	Tincher	White, Kans.
Smith, Idaho.	Strong, Pa.	Towner	Williams
Smith, Ill.	Sweet	Vestal	Wise
Smithwick	Taylor, Colo.	Voigt	Wood, Ind.
Snell	Taylor, Tenn.	Volstead	Woodyard
Snyder	Thomas	Ward	Wright
Steagall	Thompson, Ohio	Wason	Yates
Stedman	Thompson, Okla.	Watson, Pa.	Young, N. Dak.
Steenerson	Tillman	Watson, Va.	Zihlman
Stephens, Miss.	Timberlake	Wheeler	

## NOT VOTING—56.

Ashbrook	Gould	Lea, Calif.	Rouse
Bland, Ind.	Greene, Vt.	Lee, Ga.	Rowan
Browne	Griest	McClintic	Rowe
Cleary	Hamill	McGlennnon	Sabath
Costello	Hamilton	Maher	Schall
Dewalt	Hicks	Mann	Scully
Dickinson, Mo.	Hull, Tenn.	Mason	Slemp
Dooling	Ireland	Moore, Va.	Smith, N. Y.
Eagle	Johnson, Ky.	Neely	Stiness
Echols	Kelley, Mich.	O'Connor	Sullivan
Fairfield	Kettner	Porter	Summers, Wash.
Ferris	Kiess	Purnell	Tilson
Freeman	King	Reed, W. Va.	Vare
Goodall	Kreider	Riordan	Walters

So the amendment was agreed to.  
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. VARE (for) with Mr. KING (against).  
Mr. MCGLENNON (for) with Mr. IRELAND (against).  
Mr. ROWE (for) with Mr. LEE of Georgia (against).  
Mr. SCULLY (for) with Mr. MCCLINTIC (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. LEA of California.  
Mr. WALTERS with Mr. MAHER.  
Mr. GOULD with Mr. SABATH.  
Mr. KELLEY of Michigan with Mr. HAMILL.  
Mr. HAMILTON with Mr. MOORE of Virginia.  
Mr. GRIEST with Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri.  
Mr. TILSON with Mr. FERRIS.  
Mr. PURNELL with Mr. O'CONNOR.  
Mr. BLAND of Indiana with Mr. CLEARY.  
Mr. VARE with Mr. ROWAN.  
Mr. KIESS with Mr. DEWALT.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HAUGEN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

## CORRECTION OF A REFERENCE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to ask unanimous consent of the House to reconsider a reference which was made a few minutes ago, and refer that part of the President's message which refers to the Army to the Committee on Military Affairs, and that part which refers to the Navy to the Committee on Naval Affairs. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

Mr. WINGO. I make the same request.

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

## ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not recognize the gentleman for that purpose. The gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6810.

The SPEAKER. It is not necessary to make that motion.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I think the motion to adjourn would be in order.

The SPEAKER. If anybody wishes to make a motion to adjourn—

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet to-morrow, Saturday, July 19, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. EDMONDS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 1377) for the relief of Amherst W. Barber, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 125), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MACCRATE, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 946) for the relief of James A. Showen, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 126), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LITTLE, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 644) for the relief of Oscar Smith, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 127), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MACCRATE, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 909) for the relief of Ellen Agnes Monogue, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 128), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STEENERSON, from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7138) granting a franking privilege to Edith Carow Roosevelt, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 129), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6857) to authorize the change of the name of the steamer *Charlotte Graveract Breitung* to *T. K. Maher*, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 130), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 7536) donating a captured German cannon or field gun with carriage and projectiles to the town of Duke, Harnett County, N. C., for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 7537) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the town of Webster, Pa., one cannon or fieldpiece captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 7538) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Belfast, Me., two machines guns; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLAND of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 7539) to provide for monthly payment of pensions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 7540) to provide for the erection of a public building at Lincolnton, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 7541) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Fulton, Mo., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 7542) to provide for the establishment of branch offices of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENT: A bill (H. R. 7543) to create in the Army of the United States a corps to be known as the corps of chaplains; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 7544) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate a captured German cannon, with shells, to the city of Rock Island, Ill.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: A bill (H. R. 7545) to authorize an advance to the "reclamation fund" for the prompt completion of drainage work on the Rio Grande project (Texas-New Mexico), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 7546) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Algonac, Mich., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.



By Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 7547) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Red Lion, county of York, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 7548) to encourage the production of molybdenum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of Texas approving the "conditions of peace" submitted to Germany and favoring the ratification thereof by the Senate; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALMON: A bill (H. R. 7549) granting an increase of pension to Robert H. Roberts; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 7550) granting a pension to Daniel B. Yeaple; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 7551) to appoint Admiral William S. Benson, United States Navy, and Rear Admiral William S. Sims, United States Navy, as permanent admirals in the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 7552) granting an increase of pension to Robert Wilks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 7553) granting a pension to Margaret Howell Butler; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 7554) granting a pension to Carrie Lee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOREMUS: A bill (H. R. 7555) granting a pension to Sarah G. McIntire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7556) granting a pension to Pierre L. Carmouche; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7557) granting a pension to Earle F. Chase; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7558) for the relief of Elias B. Bell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7559) granting an increase of pension to Edwin C. Albertson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7560) granting an increase of pension to Walter Calhoun; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7561) granting an increase of pension to Lyman E. Stowe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 7562) granting an increase of pension to Henry Neely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 7563) to appoint Col. George K. Hunter, United States Army, retired, to the position and rank of brigadier general on the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS of Montana: A bill (H. R. 7564) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRFIELD: A bill (H. R. 7565) granting a pension to Mahala Goff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: A bill (H. R. 7566) providing that Thomas H. Rockwell, late lieutenant in the Third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, shall be deemed to have been honorably discharged from the military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLAND: A bill (H. R. 7567) for the relief of G. T. and W. B. Hastings, partners trading as Hastings Bros.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 7568) granting a pension to John B. Peters; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON: A bill (H. R. 7569) granting a pension to H. Frederica Olcott; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 7570) granting an increase of pension to Emma S. Norton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McCLINTIC: A bill (H. R. 7571) for the relief of Lucius K. Osterhout; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 7572) granting a pension to Benjamin C. Read; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 7573) authorizing payment of compensation to Pasquale Dolce; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MONAHAN of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 7574) granting a pension to Mary Holmes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 7575) granting an increase of pension to Cass C. Lapoint; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 7577) granting an increase of pension to Sherman G. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 7578) granting a pension to Mary A. Donaldson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UPSHAW: A bill (H. R. 7579) granting a pension to Tebitha Cummings; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7580) granting an increase of pension to George W. Ryan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 7581) granting a pension to Dolly Becker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 7582) granting a pension to Eleanora D. Powers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of the Japanese Association of Hawaii, Honolulu, favoring the relaxation of the prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of the International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, of Turners Falls, Mass., in favor of league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CAREW: Petition of National Federation of Federal Employees, of Washington, D. C., against the Good amendment to the Nolan wage bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Washington Central Labor Union, by N. A. James, secretary, against the Good amendment to the Nolan minimum-wage bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. DARROW: Resolution of the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, recommending the abolition of the Office of Comptroller of the Currency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Stokes & Smith Co., David Lupton's Sons Co., Biddle-Gaumer Co., and Arthur C. Jackson, of Philadelphia, protesting against House joint resolution 121; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of United Commercial Travelers of Dayton, Ohio, favoring the meter-liter-gram system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDY of Colorado: Petition of the United National Association of Post Office Clerks, Pueblo, Colo., asking for advanced compensation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: Petition of sundry citizens of Bruning, Strang, Shickley, Steele City, and Ong, Nebr., urging repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: Petition of Horace O. Lanza, of Buffalo, N. Y., urging Congress to retain light wines and beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of W. H. Sanford, of Buffalo, N. Y., against the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Richmond Avenue Methodist Church, of Buffalo, N. Y., for full enforcement of prohibition laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Lantz Bros. & Co., of Buffalo, N. Y., objecting to certain parts of Esch-Pomerene bill (H. R. 4378); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAHER: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of New York, for the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, ice cream, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELL: Petition of sundry citizens of New York, protesting against the tax on sodas, soft drinks, ice cream, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of Wyandot Club, of the city of New York, urging recognition of the republic of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Central Bureau of Extension Table Manufacturers, of Chicago, Ill., urging retention of the zone advances; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Federal Employees' Union, of Louisville, Ky., urging enactment of Lehlbach retirement bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Federal Employees' Union of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., urging enactment of Lehlbach retirement bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Dover Federal Employees' Union, Dover, N. J., urging favorable report of committee to the House of the Lehlbach retirement bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Washington Central Labor Union, urging defeat of the Good amendment to Nolan minimum-wage bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the advisory board, Philadelphia and Camden Federation of Pennsylvania Lines, urging what is known as the Plum plan of ownership and operation of railroads, and until enacted for Government control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Self-Determination League of Liberty, New York City, advocating drastic restriction and regulation of all spirituous liquors and Federal law preventing the manufacture of adulterated and impure liquors of all kinds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIEGEL: Petition of the Wyandot Club, of New York City, asking for self-determination for Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, July 19, 1919.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

With renewed faith and confidence, O God, our Heavenly Father, in the overruling and inward ruling of Thy providence, help these, Thy servants, with true devotion to duty, to go forward with the business of the hour, assured that if they are true to themselves as light is given them all will be well; for Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leaves of absence were granted as follows:

To Mr. LEE of Georgia, for two days, on account of illness.

To Mr. KRAUS, for two days, on account of important business.

### WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. BRINSON, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Thomas E. Delvin, no adverse report having been made thereon.

Mr. IGOR, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the cases of Esther C. Vernell, Sixty-fifth Congress, and Edward Flannagan, Sixty-fourth Congress, no adverse reports having been made thereon.

Mr. WALSH, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the cases of George C. Peterson (H. R. 1631), Albert Damon (H. R. 12963), William H. Le Baron (H. R. 11045), Cora F. Withell (H. R. 10687), Annie Casey (H. R. 13094), Peter Black (H. R. 9213), Hodges W. Drayton (H. R. 12978), Sylvester D. Phinney (H. R. 1628), Luther F. Thayer (H. R. 12979), William Johnson (H. R. 12980), and Carrie C. Washburn (H. R. 1630), all of the Sixty-fifth Congress, no adverse reports having been made thereon.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that yesterday they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following joint resolution and bill:

H. J. Res. 73. Joint resolution authorizing the President to extend invitations to other nations to send representatives to the World Cotton Conference to be held at New Orleans, La., October 13 to 16, 1919, inclusive; and

H. R. 7343. An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 3, 1920, and for other purposes.

### PROHIBITION ENFORCEMENT.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the House will resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the prohibition-enforcement bill.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, owing to the fact that there are so few people here, I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio makes the point that there is no quorum present, and evidently there is not.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Ackerman	Echols	Kreider	Riddick
Andrews, Md.	Edmonds	Layton	Riordan
Anthony	Elston	Lee, Ga.	Rouse
Ashbrook	Fairfield	Linthicum	Rowan
Bacharach	Freeman	McClintic	Rowe
Benham	Garland	McGlennan	Sanders, N. Y.
Benson	Goodall	McKenzie	Schall
Brinson	Gould	McKinley	Scully
Brooks, Pa.	Greene, Vt.	MacCrate	Slemp
Browne	Griest	MacGregor	Smith, N. Y.
Browning	Hamill	Maher	Stephens, Ohio
Burke	Hamilton	Mann	Stines
Caldwell	Hicks	Mason	Sullivan
Campbell, Pa.	Houghton	Merritt	Summers, Wash.
Carew	Ireland	Murphy	Tilson
Cleary	Johnston, N. Y.	Neely	Vare
Costello	Kearns	Nicholls, S. C.	Walters
Dale	Kelley, Mich.	Platt	Ward
Dewalt	Kelly, Pa.	Porter	Watson, Pa.
Dooling	Kettner	Purnell	Wilson, Ill.
Dupré	Kless	Radcliffe	Yates
Eagan	King	Randall, Calif.	Young, N. Dak.
Eagle	Kraus	Reavis	Zihlman

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and thirty-eight Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend further proceedings under the call.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend further proceedings under the call.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves that further proceedings under the call be suspended. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

### LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may make a statement, not to exceed five minutes in length.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. WINGO. What about?

Mr. GOOD. I wanted to get unanimous consent in order to bring up a resolution to make the appropriations that have been approved since July 1 available from July 1. They are not retroactive. It will take but a few minutes.

Mr. WINGO. It is a matter of public business?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. CURRIE of Michigan. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I have just learned that the Senate is not in session to-day, and therefore no action that the House might take to-day would become effective. I therefore feel obliged to object.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that I shall be compelled to ask for a rule, and it will take more time to get a rule and put this matter through in that way than the five minutes that would be required to put it through at this time.

### PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING BEVERAGES.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. Under the rule the House resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6810, prohibiting intoxicating beverages, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] will take the chair.

Thereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6810, with Mr. Good in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6810, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6810) to prohibit intoxicating beverages, and to regulate the manufacture, production, use, and sale of high-proof spirits for other than beverage purposes, and to insure an ample supply of alcohol and promote its use in scientific research and in the development of fuel, dye, and other lawful industries.

The CHAIRMAN. Several amendments are pending.

Mr. BLAND of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I understand there is only one amendment pending. I want to offer an amendment to that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment to the pending amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Volstead], which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLAND of Missouri to the amendment offered by Mr. VOLSTEAD: After the words "a record and report of sales" strike out the words "If the commissioner shall find that any article can be successfully and economically manufactured so as to contain less than one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol by volume, he shall, by regulation, forbid the manufacture and sale of any such article